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# CAROLO BRUGMANN TPOФEIA 

## PREFACE.

THE need for a collected edition of the Italic Dialects has long been felt. This is, I believe, the first attempt to present a full record of them all, with some account of the history of the tribes who spoke them. The separation between Umbrian and the rest of the Dialects which has marked the chief collections of the last fifty years is inconvenient and often misleading; and since Mommsen's great edition of the Oscan group as it was known in 1850, very few endeavours have been made to treat the inscriptions as records of anything but a language. Thus the study of the Dialects has been completely severed from that of other parts of the life of Classical Italy. But neither the language nor the institutions of Rome can be fully understood if they are isolated from the kindred speech and customs of peoples living within fifty miles of her gates. Nor on the other hand can any safe use be made of the Dialects for wider philological research,-and in this connexion the peculiar importance of Oscan is becoming more and more manifest,-if the first key to their interpretation, our knowledge from other sources of ancient Italy, be laid aside in favour of a purely linguistic method which defeats its own ends.

But none the less it is for students of Indo-European Comparative Grammar that the Italic Dialects possess the greatest interest; and on this side the work of an editor has been greatly changed and in one sense lightened by the
progress of Philology in the last twenty years. The introduction of strict method in Phonetics rules out at once a great multitude of conjectures. What on looking back ${ }^{1}$ upon his work of 1850 Mommsen calls with a sigh the 'ars difficillima nesciendi' has become many degrees easier since then. Nowhere, indeed, has Mommsen himself displayed more brilliantly than in the Unteritalische Dialekte that scientific method of historical and epigraphical research which is perhaps the greatest gift of his genius to this generation ; but it was not till thirty years later that a similar exactness was developed in Phonology by the teaching of Johannes Schmidt, Leskien, and Brugmann. To quote only one example of the results of stricter canons; the discovery, reached simultaneously by many different scholars, that Osc. ${ }_{2}(\vdash)$ represents regularly an original $\bar{e}$ and an original $\check{\imath}$ (but neither $\breve{e}$ nor $\bar{\imath}$ ) has made it possible for the first time to assign whole categories of forms to their proper places in the verbal system (cf. Vol. II. p. 495).

We have direct knowledge of the Italic Dialects, that is of the Dialects which with Latin form the Italic branch of the Indo-European languages-(1) from Inscriptions, (2) from Coins, (3) from scattered records in histories, grammars and glossaries ; to this must be added (4) the indirect evidence of the names of ancient Places and (5) ancient Persons in the several Dialect-areas.

The attempt made in the present edition has been to collect this evidence as completely as possible, in obedience to one cardinal principle,-that of distinguishing sharply what is certain from what is merely probable. Many earlier commentaries have undertaken to explain everything, and their ignominious fate may well serve as a warning. An editor's first duty is to present the existing material for study as fully as he can; his second, to indicate the questions which mark the limits of present knowledge ; and

[^0]it is only in the third place that he may venture \%\%тou


Thus in the epigraphical sections the reader will find beside the text of the inscriptions, which is generally based on my own transcription of the originals ${ }^{2}$, only what may be called their external data; provenance, alphabet, and the like. The Glossary includes all dialectic forms contained in the body of the book; but in the case of words whose meaning is still uncertain either conjectures which seemed to possess some degree of probability are quoted with their authors' names, or where such conjectures seemed still to be wanting, nothing is given but the occurrences of the word and its parsing so far as that is clear. It need hardly be said that the line of probability is often very hard to draw, and some proportion of misjudgment is inevitable. The lists of Names, if used with caution, may, I hope, illustrate the Phonetic peculiarities of the corresponding Dialects; the details of the Notation will be found on pp.xxii ff. The spelling of the names has of course been verified with especial care. These lists, with the corresponding Indices, make a kind of 'Directory' to Ancient Italy which may perhaps be of use to others than students of the Dialects. I should be especially glad if they were found to throw any light on the dim period of Italian history which precedes continuous tradition; that is, the period which may be said to end about 420 в.c. (p. 83 ); but any such enquiry ${ }^{3}$ lies altogether beyond
 $\varepsilon$ is $\mu \in \sigma o \nu$ oib $\mu \epsilon \theta a$ $\delta \epsilon i \bar{\nu} \tau \ell \theta \epsilon \nu \alpha$. This latter principle I have adopted with some necessary reserve.

2 The collection includes, I believe, all inscriptions made publici iuris before September 1896, when pp. 1-448 of Vol. 1. were finally printed off, and in the Addenda at the end of Vol. ir. will be found a few that have come to light since.
${ }^{3}$ An example of the kind of evidence to be gleaned may perhaps be admitted in a note. The distinction between the ethnica in -co- and -no- seems to correspond to some historical change. In central Italy the names in -no- (Sabini, cf. Osc. Safinio-, Latini, Frentani, Hirpini, Lucani etc.) seem to belong to the speech of a later stratum of population which everywhere subdued the bearers, some of whom must have been the authors, of the names in -co- (Osci, Volsci,
the scope of this book, though a few necessary ethnographical notes will be found among the Place-names.

The arrangement of the book follows a purely geographical order, which is meant to aid, not to exclude, any narrower dialect-grouping which may in future become clear (as at Capua, see von Planta Osk.-Umb. Gram. p. 252). In two cases only I have ventured to mark off new groups, the 'North Oscan' and the 'Latinian' (the term 'latinisch' has already been used in some such sense), whose separate unity, so far as it is yet clear, seems to be of some importance.

Kiepert's admirable maps of Italy and its parts are now in such common use that it seemed undesirable to abridge them to suit the limits of this edition. Indeed even his maps at the end of Vols. IX. and X. of the Corp. Inscc. Latinorum scarcely contain one half the place-names here enumerated; for the very good reason that even Kiepert is not prepared to assign the rest to precise points of locality, although it is often clear to what district they belong. Most of the Inscriptions given in the Appendix have been included in some previous edition ${ }^{2}$, and their absence from the text seemed to call for at least so much explanation. Since Mommsen's demonstration of the independent position of Messapian in the Indo-European family, its remains have never been treated as Italic. On philological grounds I should have been glad to add them to the Appendix, but their importance hardly less than their number and difficulty forbade any cursory treatment. If any reader would have me apologise for excluding Etruscan inscriptions as rigidly as possible ${ }^{3}$ -

[^1]and in dealing with the inscc. of Falerii I have applied the rule more stringently than has been usual,--let me beg him first of all to become a subscriber to Pauli's Corpus Inscriptionum Etruscarum, and secondly to read almost any of the articles on Etruscan in the same scholar's Altitalische Studien; and, if he be still unsatisfied, to turn to Deecke's last utterance upon the question (in Bursian's Jahresbericht, Suppl. Bd. z. III. Folge), which amounts to a recantation of his own heresy against the doctrine which first made him famous, the doctrine, now become a certainty, that Etruscan cannot be called an IndoEuropean language.

It is a pleasure to acknowledge how much I owe to the work of my predecessors and to the generous help of many friends. My greatest debts are to Brugmann and Bücheler in questions of language, to Mommsen and Ridgeway in Epigraphy, and they are of a kind altogether transcending specific obligations. The whole scope and method of the book has been determined by the teaching of Professors Brugmann and Ridgeway; indeed I can hardly attempt to put my gratitude to the latter into words,--the direct help he has given me pervades nearly the whole of the first volume. In the task of interpretation, the first and greatest source from which I have drawn, like every other student of the Dialects, has been the learning stored in the commentaries of Bücheler and Mommsen, and in Mommsen's collections of different kinds in Volumes IX. and X. of the Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum. For Umbrian I owe much also to Bréal's commentary with its admirable facsimiles, and in collecting the Place-names to the valuable Glossary of Fabretti's Corpus Inscriptionum Italicarum, where I found references to a number of forms in late authorities which would probably have else escaped me altogether. Zvetaieff's convenient editions of Oscan and the Minor Dialects, especially the Inscriptiones Italiae Inferioris Dialecticae, have been, of course, continually before me.

Of more recent writers I have derived much help from Beloch's Campanien, and his Italischer Bund unter Röm. Hegemonie; Buck's Oskischer Vocalismus, and Von Planta's Osk.Umb. Grammatile Vol. I., though in lecturing on the Dialects from 1889-1893 I had been led to form a judgment for myself on many questions of Phonology. Von Planta's second volume, containing an edition of the Osco-Umbrian inscc., unfortunately appeared too late to be of service for any part of this edition but the Addenda, where he has kindly permitted me to make a few quotations from his text. Less extensive but not less valuable help I owe, first, to my dear friend Mr Herbert Dukinfield Darbishire, whose brilliant career was cut off in 1893; he had read the proofs of about the first 60 pages. Then to Dr J. P. Postgate, who did the same kind service, though of course without undertaking any degree of responsibility, for some of the Gloss-sections, and the Syntax; and to the Rev. E. S. Roberts, to whom I owe my first interest in Epigraphy, for his criticism of the section on the Alphabets. As the last volume of Thilo and Hagen's edition of Servius was still delayed, the former scholar very kindly sent me a list of passages in which the Servian Commentary touched on Italic place-names or usages. Dr B. V. Head, now Her Majesty's Keeper of the Coins, gave me most generous advice in compiling the sections on the Italic Coin-legends, sections which are, of course, largely based upon his great Historia Numorum. To Prof. Antonio De Nino of Sulmona, besides untiring kindness during my visit to the Abruzzi, I owe excellent 'impressions' of many inscriptions which were inaccessible at the time, or which have been discovered since. Prof. A. Sogliano, of the Naples Museum, generously undertook the trouble of adding accents to a large number of the modern Place-names, thus putting on record for the first time much important information.

For other valuable help of different kinds I am indebted to Prof. Carl Pauli of Lugano, Dr Dressel of Berlin, Prof. Bormann of Vienna, Dr J. S. Reid of Cambridge, Mr W. M.

Lindsay of Oxford, Prof. E. A. Gardner of University College, London, Mr H. T. Francis of the Cambridge University Library; my colleagues Prof. G. C. Richards and Mr F. T. Arnold; my old pupils Miss E. Purdie of Newnham College, and Mr F. G. Plaistowe of Queens' College, Cambridge; and Mr H. S. Cowman the Curator of the Fitzwilliam Archaeological Library; other acknowledgements will be found in their several places. I have further to thank the Council of University College, Cardiff, for special leave of absence in Italy in 1894, and the authorities of the Worts Archaeological Fund for a grant in aid of that journey.

I desire to thank the Syndics of the Cambridge University Press most cordially for undertaking this book, and, in particular, for their generosity in extending its limits and in all matters of typography. Nor can I express too warmly my gratitude for the vigilant and scholarly help of the readers on the staff of that Press.

Above all must be recorded the perpetual aid of one whose companionship in the most tedious endeavours has been itself their exceeding great reward.
R. S. C.

Llandaff,
April, 1897.
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E. S. Roberts, Introduction to Greek Epigraphy. Cambridge, 1887.
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Campanien (Zweite Auflage). Berlin, 1890.
By the kindness of Mr W. H. D. Rouse and Mr H. M. Bower I was allowed to see an early proof of the latter's essay on The Elevation and Procession of the Ceri at Gubbio, which has now appeared (Folk Lore Society, David Nutt, 1897).

There can, I think, be little doubt that this existing procession has certain features in common with the Iguvine lustration, so that as the interpretation of the Tabulae Iguvinae advances, a comparison of details in the two ceremonies may become instructive. And even now every student of ancient Italian customs will be grateful for Mr Bower's delightful description (and photographs) of this curious survival.

## SIGN゙S AND ABBREVIATIONS.

## A. In the text of the Inscriptions and Commentary

All inscriptions are printed in heavy type, which is spaced when the original is engraved in the local alphabet, Oscan, Umbrian or Faliscan, while the Greek alphabet is reproduced. Where the type is not spaced, the original is in one form or other of the Latin alphabet: thus the Volscian alphabet is printed similarly ${ }^{1}$.

But dialectic forms known to us only through ms. tradition are printed in heavy italics, and I have used these also to represent the text of a few inscc. only preserved in old ms. copies.

Conjectural restorations are printed in Roman type, e.g. sakara[klom].
Conjoint letters ('ligatures') are marked by a small link beneath, e.g. Osc. HN an.

A line underneath a letter indicates that it is damaged in the original.
$t$, that the text printed is probably corrupt, whether through injury of the material or the engraver's mistake.

* as in $\mathbf{a}^{*}[1]$ trud denotes an emendation, i.e. an alteration which assumes an error on the part of the engraver.
.... denote spaces on the inscription where letters once stood or may have stood. Each punct denotes room for one letter. Where a blank space is left between the last punct and the sign of the end of the line (e.g. in no. 40) it is implied that the number of missing letters cannot be further defined. Where any such hiatus occurs elsewhere than at the end of a line the reader is warned in the note.

Marks of punctuation have only been inserted where they were both necessary and fairly certain. They will be found to be of small size, and slightly above the base-level of the line in which they occur.
${ }^{1}$ Nos. 98 and 99, which are semi-Oscan inscc. in Campano-Etr. a $\beta$, are unspaced, in order to mark them off from 97, an insc. of the same class, which is written in Osc. $\alpha \beta$.

Interpuncts, that is stops to divide words from one another, are not reproduced in the text, except by the usual interval ; their use or non-use in the inscc. generally and their absence at any point are always noted in the commentary.
| marks the end of a line on the original. The numbers on the left hand of the inscc. refer to these lines.
|| marks the beginning of every fifth line.
Some twenty inscriptions are of special importance for a first study of the dialects, either from their extent, or from the comparative certainty of the received interpretation ; the commentary on these is printed in larger type.

The compendium $a \beta$ is used for alphabet.

## Transcription of V in Latin Alphabet.

This letter is always represented in this edition, both as vowel and consonant, by $u$. But some of the dialects are written both in the local alphabet and in the Latin, and in the former distinct symbols are employed for the vowel and the consonant. These are respectively transcribed $u$ and $v$. Whatever view may be held as to the use of $v$ in ordinary Latin texts, it will be agreed that in dealing with dialectic forms written in Latin alphabet, it is desirable to represent the original spelling faithfully, since in many of them (e.g. Osc.-L. Benventod, Umb. iuengar) it is quite uncertain whether the actual sound denoted by $V$ was a vowel or a consonant.

But words which are recorded in local as well as in Latin alphabet are usually quoted in this respect with the more explicit local spelling, so that, e.g. Igwium not Iguuium is the spelling adopted; except only in quoting continuous passages written in Latin alphabet, especially direct citations from Latin sources.

## B. In the Lists of Place Names

The reader's attention is especially invited to the following details of the notation.

## 1. Arrangement

Class A (Well attested) includes generally forms which occur without variation either
(a) at least twice in trustworthy inscc.
( $\beta$ ) at least twice in first-class texts, i.e. in the text of the best authors (e.g. Vergil and Horace) in passages where the reading is beyond all doubt.
$(\gamma)$ at least once in one of each of such authorities.
( $\delta$ ) at least once in one of such authorities, attested further by a modern name exactly corresponding according to known phonetic laws of Italian.

Class B (Less certain) includes generally forms which
(a) are found in one trustworthy insc. and nowhere else.
$(\beta)$ are found more than once in ancient authors but not more than once in a first-class text and in no trustworthy insc. ; or
( $\gamma$ ) occur with variation in the best authors.
Class C (Doubtful) includes generally all such forms as for any reason appear to be less, certain than those in A and B .

The names in $A, B$, and $D$ are arranged roughly from south to north ; and in $C$ also, as far as their position is known.

## 2. Signs of Provenance

cl. (i.e. 'classical') denotes that a form occurs at least twice in first-class texts or frequently in ancient authors generally.
insc. denotes that a form occurs once in some inscription, the reference to which is given if it is the best authority for the form; inscc. denotes occurrence on more than one inscription, or repeated occurrence on a trustworthy inscription.
nm . denotes that the form occurs on coins.
When either or all of these signs (cl., insc(c)., nm.) follow the last of two or more consecutive kindred forms (e.g. Circeii opp. -ceienses cl. inscc.) they apply to them all; except that often only the ethnicon occurs in inscc. but both that and the place-name in classical authors; and that in coins the name is often abbreviated. Unless there was some doubt as to either form, I have not thought it worth while to indicate these distinctions.

Names given only in Greek type (e.g. Níau有 fl.) occur only in Greek authors.

A single reference, or only two references, attached to a form imply that so far as I can find it occurs nowhere else.
al. following a reference denotes that the form occurs more than once but in no better authority than that given.

An author's name without further reference added to a form, implies that it occurs several times in that author.

Itinn. denotes that the form occurs in more than one ancient Itinerary; these are all quoted in C.I.L. and the reference is given at the beginning of every list of place-names.

* is attached to forms which do not themselves occur but may be inferred from their derivatives (e.g. the adj. *Lucus in the masculine).


## 3. Other Siyns

( ) round part of a name imply that the one part is used sometimes with, sometimes without the other, e.g. Suessa (A urunca). What follows applies to both cases, unless it is otherwise stated.
[ ] denote a name of Latin origin, e.g. [Valentia].

## [ ] a name of Greek origin, e.g. [Leucopetra].

For many reasons neither of these classes could well be omitted, and many of them may be adaptations or translations of earlier local names.
$\{$ couples different names of the same place, e.g. Thurii and Copiae.
The Greek form of a name is only added to the Latin for special reasons ; often as evidence of quantity, e.g. Laus $\Lambda \hat{a} o s$.

Quantities are only marked when attested by the occurrence of the form in verse, or by some definite statement; final syllables, as a rule, are left unmarked and also the adjectival terminations -anus -inus, since their first syllable is presumably always long, but the particular forms of course do not always occur in poetry.

Modern names are printed in Italics. They are only added when they seem to bear some kind of historical relation to the ancient, whether the relation be purely phonetic or no.
? before the modern name indicates that its connexion with the ancient is doubtful.

The accents on the modern place-names mark the syllable accented in the present Italian pronunciation. In the absence of any record of this available to scholars, Prof. Antonio Sogliano, Assistant Director of the Naples Museum, generously undertook to add them so far as his personal acquaintance with the names allowed. The grave accent denotes an 'open' vowel (as in Firènze, Nèpi; but Ferónia, Fibréno with 'close' $o$ and $e$ respectively).

It seemed desirable to add in the paragraphs marked D such modern names as might have, from their form, any likelihood of representing unrecorded ancient ones; but names like Bellaguardia (with Germanic $-r d-$ ) have been altogether omitted. Except by such negative tests I cannot vouch in any degree for the age of the modern names given in Class D ; indeed from attempts I have made in particular cases I doubt if there are any means of ascertaining it yet available to scholars. But the form of every name has been verified; those of towns in the official Dizionario Geografico Postale, Roma, 1880; those of mountains and rivers either in Vogel's Italien in 4 Blättern, Gotha, 1889, or in the large Government Map of Italy now being published in parts. A few names however seemed to call for insertion which were not to be found in these authorities, given either by Kiepert's maps (at the end of C.I.L. IX. and x.), or to be found in a large but unfinished Dizionario Corografico dell' Italia, published by Civ. Giuseppe, Milan 1852 ${ }^{1}$. Such forms are marked (K.) or (Kiep.) and (Diz. Cor.) respectively. Other authorities are cited in full. A number of modern names which have been traditionally compared with ancient names, e.g. in de Vit's Onomasticon, I have felt bound to omit as unsupported, such as an alleged town Furfone on the site of the ancient Furfo, a river Cosa corresponding to Strabo's Kóvas ( 256 B).
${ }^{1}$ I regret that Amato Amati's new Dizionario Corografico was inaccessible to me (equally so in Cambridge, London, Rome and Naples).

## C. In the Lists of Personal Names

These are based on the Indices of C.I.L. IV., Ix., x., xIv., on the proof sheets of Vol. xI. Pt. 2 (which were kindly lent me by Prof. Bormann), and on parts of Kaibel's Inscc. Graecue Italiou et Siceliae. I have occasionally added, under a separate heading, a few names of persons whom we know from ancient authors to have belonged to particular tribes, when the name has not occurred in inscc., which is rarely the case. But I have made no attempt to collect such names.

Only the Nomina are given completely. For simplicity's sake they are given in the feminine singular as implying gens.

The Cognomina selected are those which appeared to me either to show dialectic characteristics or to have a bearing on some point in the dialectinscriptions. Where both masculine and feminine forms of one Cognomen occur, only the former is given.

Frequent (Class A) implies at least six occurrences in the district; Class B contains names that occur less than six times, and Class C those that occur only once, in that district.
( ) round a name standing by itself implies that it only occurs in the derivative adoptive cognomen with -anus, e.g. (Caesoniana) 36 B implies that Caesonianus occurs more than once in Daunia.
$l ., s$. after a name imply that in the great majority of its occurrences it belongs respectively to a libertus or servus.
$(g, l)$ implies that the name occurs in both Greek and Latin inscc. of the district.
(g) that it is found only in the Greek inscc.
(The lists do not include any names but such as occur in the
(sup.) sources specified for each respective area, but if any of these names are found also in the preceding dialectic inscriptions,
(inf.) (sup.) is added; (inf.) denotes that the name occurs in some dialect-inscription elsewhere and will be found in the Glossary.
All the forms which for any reason might be suspected of showing marks of a dialect other than urban Latin have been underlined, e.g. Tettia, Rufus, Petronia (contrast Lat. tri-quetro-). It was clearly desirable to mark too many rather than too few, and I by no means wish to be understood as asserting dialectic character for all such forms. The following is, I believe, a complete list of the phonetic peculiarities thus indicated ; many of these may prove to be natural either to classical Latin or at least to the Latin of the particular period (C.I.L. includes inscc. down to about 600 A.D. ; see Mommsen, ib. Ix. p. vii.) in which the name occurs; and I should be sorry to be thought to prejudge any one of the many questions which these forms raise; my object throughout has been simply to provide material for a judgment, not to give one.

## List of phonetic peculiarities marked in the LISTS OF PERSONAL NAMES.

## A. In Vowels and Diphthongs.

1. oe-preserved, e.g. Coelia; v. Lindsay, Lat. Lang. p. 246.
2. $\bar{u}$ for $\bar{o}$, e.g. Catunia; v. p. 225 and Von Planta, Osk.-Umb. Gram. I. p. 116.
3. ě for $\breve{\imath}$, e.g. Caledia beside -idia (cf. Osc. $i=$ Italic $\breve{\varepsilon}$, v. pp. 47 and 495, and Von Planta p. 96).
4. $\bar{\imath}$ for $\bar{u}$, e.g. Betitia beside -tut-; v. p. 225, Conway, Am. J. Phil. 11. 306, and Von Planta p. 129.
5. ō for au, e.g. Clodia; v. Conway, Idg. Forsch. 4. 215.
6. Syncope of short vowel in second syllable, e.g. Vespria, perhaps Opsia; v. Von Planta p. 293.
7. Anaptyxis, e.g. Calauia beside Caluia; cf. p. 46 and v. Von Planta p. 253.

## B. In Consonants.

1. Medial -f-preserved, e.g. Aufidia; v. p. 221 and Lindsay p. 78.
2. -s- between vowels, e.g. Caesia; v. p. 222 and Lindsay p. 305.
3. -s- before $m$ or $n$, e.g. Dusmia; v. Von Planta p. 478.
4. -rs-, e.g. Carsicia; v. Von Planta p. 486, Lindsay p. 277.
5. -tt-, e.g. Pollitta; v. p. 224 with the authorities cited.
6. -nn-, e.g. Sisenna; v. p. 226 with the authorities cited.
7. Doubled consonant before -i-, $-u-,-r-,-l-$, e.g. Iunnia, Attia, Appia, Appuleia; with cognate forms (shown to be such by Ritschl, Opusc. 4. p. 262) like Vetteia, Appaea, Cocceia, Attidia; v. Von Planta p. 537.
8. Confusion of Mediae and Tenues, e.g. Vibpsania; v. p. 45 with footn.
9. -tl-, e:g. Cotla; v. Lindsay p. 81.
10. $P$ - for Qu- in Pontia, Petronia, etc.; v. Glossary.
11. Assibilation of dentals or palatals before -i- (cf. the note to 206), e.g. Titsiena, Tuxia (if for Tuccia).
12. -st- for -xt-, e.g. Sestia; v. Von Planta p. 376.
13. Stl-, Sl-, e.g. Stlaccia, Slabia; v. Lindsay p. 307.

## PART I.

THE RECORDS OF THE DIALECTS.

## ERRATA IN VOLUME I.

Page 1318 and 21 read $0 u$ for $0 \mathbf{V}$.
38 Dele Lucilia in 34 A.
68 l. 14 from below read possibly for probably and v. p. 523.
103 first column $l$. 1 read 88 for 89.
115 last line of 109 read veruis for veruis.
123 l. 18,19 read it probably serves, and dele the sentence is it a mark of punctuation?

134 Read maras not $\mathbf{m} 2 \mathrm{~m} 1 \mathrm{~s}$ in $137 f .8$.
142 l. 5 of the note to 145 read 148 for 118 .
152 l. 8 from below read used for invented.
157 In the second column read Lusia, not Lusius.
165 In the third column dele Petillia.
180 l. 2 of the heading read 162-167 for 162-169.
192 ll. 21 and 23 of 175 read piotereipid and dekmanniiis for put- and-uis.
226 l. 5 for the second line of REMARK 8 read (e.g. ueha' uia' Varro L. L. 1. 14) compare either Osc. $i=$ Lat. $\check{i}$, or Praen. conea Praen. and Fal. filea etc.
253 last line of second paragraph: read 10 and 12 for 9 and 11.
307 Dele Bauco in 278 D.
332 l. 7 dele Castrum Inui and see 256 B.
338 l. 15 dele Clivus Publicius.
366 Fiscellus mons should have been classed under $\mathbf{A}$.
ib. last paragraph of C read in Lake Fucinus for in a lake, and cf. the Glossary s.v. Esalicom.
373
377 Inscriptions 315-317, 323, and $337-344$ should have been printed in
382 spaced type as the originals are in Faliscan Alphabet.
383)

397 l. 18 of the insc. in Note zlii. read dicator|ei], not dictator|ei].
401 l. 5 from below read (W, M) for (M,N).
428 The superfuous words (Fourth Period) should have been removed from the title of $366 ; v, p, 405 f$.
452 Dele Aso in 374 D.

## THE ITALIC DIALECTS.

## I. SOUTHERN OSCAN.

## A. Messana.

## 1-4. Mamertine Inscriptions of Messana.

1 Discovered in Messina 'ad angulum veteris turris' in 1611; then copied by Buonfiglio (Historia Siciliana, ad fin.) and later by Gualter (cited by Rejna, Notiz. istor. d. Citta di Messina, 1658). A fragment of an identical inscr. was brought to the Messina Museum in 1815, whither about 1850 the first was at last transferred, after being re-discovered at intervals. From these four sources the text was restored by Mommsen, who conjectures that the building dedicated was not in temple but the wall of fortification: cf. the inscription of Lacco, p. 84.

$5 \quad \mu \alpha \mu \in \rho \tau \iota \nu 0 . \mid(\alpha) \pi \pi \epsilon \lambda \lambda о \nu \nu \eta \iota \sigma а к о \rho о$.
The first fragment has lost three or four letters at the beginning and end of each line, except 1.3 , which is shorter and preserved bodily; the second contains only the last half of all the lines; the letters now wanting on both the stones are supplied from Rejna's copy, with which Buonfiglio's agrees exactly except in giving $\eta \nu 0$ for R.'s $\epsilon \iota \nu \epsilon$ in 1. 4. The punctuation is Mommsen's. The inscr. is finely engraved in TarentineIonic $a \beta$ (i.e. Ionic with $[=v$ and presumably $\vdash=h$ as in the Tabulae Heracleenses), in its fully developed form, from left to
right, with $\xi=\sigma, P=\rho, o v=\bar{u}$; for $o$ and $\omega$ see Note to the Table of Alphabets, Part II a inf. The date cannot be long after the Mamertine seizure of Messana, about 289 B.c. v. 4 inf. See also 309 A, s.v. Mamers. U. D. p. 193 xii. 39, Zvet. Osc. 160 xviii. 14, Fabr. 3063.

## $2 \mu \alpha \mu \epsilon \rho \tau \iota \nu \circ v \mu$

$3 \lambda \pi \alpha \alpha$
On bricks in the Museum at Messina. Ion, a from left to right. U. D. p. 199, Zvet. Osc. 161 and 162, Fabr. 3064.

## 4 Mamertine Coins.

4 a. $\mu \alpha \mu \in \rho \tau \iota \nu о \cup \mu$
b. $\mu a \mu \in \tau \iota \nu \circ \cup \mu$

Only one specimen of each of these coins is preserved; both are bronze, (a) with Head of Artemis )( an omphalos or cortina covered with a net, (b) with Apollo laureatus )(Bellona advancing with spear and shield. Both are in Ionic $a \beta$, but ( $\alpha$ ) is retrograde, (b) from left to right, and since the later coins of the Mamertines have a Greek legend ( $\mu a \mu \in \rho \tau \tau \nu \omega \nu$, dating from 282 to 210 b.c. and later, see Head, Historia Numorum p. 136) the older of these two must be ( $a$ ) which shows the regular direction of Oscan writing, while $(b)$ shows the beginning of Greek influence. This chronological relation between the two directions is exactly reversed in the earliest Campanian inscriptions, cf. no. 8 inf.

For (a) see Friedländer, Oskische Münzen p. 60, Mom. U. D. p. 201; for (b), Salinas, La Collezione Numismatica Pennisi, tab. ix. 22, quoted in Ephem. Epigr. II. p. 193 by Corssen, who on quite inadequate grounds (cf. Head, Hist. Num. p. 136) assigned this coin to Maر́́ptıo in Bruttiis (inf. 11 c ).

## B. Bruttii ${ }^{1}$.

## 5-10 Bruttian Inseriptions.

5 Found in Monteleone near Bivona (Vibo) and first published by Capialbi in 1846, in whose museum it remained till 1875: facsim. Mommsen, U.D. tab. xii. 37 , p. 191.

## SıovF $\in \iota F \in \rho \sigma \circ \rho \in \iota \tau \alpha v \rho \circ \mu$

On a carelessly inscribed bronze plate $7 \frac{1}{2}$ by $1 \frac{1}{4} \mathrm{in}$. ( 187 by 033 m .) with holes for nails at either end. Tar.-Ionic $a \beta(\Gamma=v, \xi=s ; \mathrm{P}=r)$ from left to right; there is a slight space after the first two words, but no interpunct. Mommsen (U. D. p. 191) suggests it was affixed to a bronze votive ox, although real oxen (Macrob. III. 10, but v. Sil. Pun. 6. 647) could not properly be offered to Jupiter.

Momms. l. c., Fabr. 3034, Zvet. Osc. 146.

6 Place of discovery uncertain; now in the Museum it Palermo. First published in 1867 by Fabretti, C. I. Ital. 2890 bis.

## 

$$
\tau \rho \epsilon \beta \iota \varsigma \quad \sigma \quad f \in \sigma \tau \iota \epsilon \varsigma \quad \delta \in \delta \epsilon \tau
$$

On a broken bronze helmet, rather faintly engraved with a sharp chisel. Ion. $\boldsymbol{a} \boldsymbol{\beta}$, retrograde, with no break or interpunct between the words. The value of the sign S, which Havet (Mém. Soc. Ling. Paris, v.. p. 228) read as $z$, I believe to be $f$, v. inf. no. 138, and cf. Conway, Camb. Philolog. Soc. Transactions III., p. 223, Class. Rev. 1894 p. 348, and Thurneysen, Indog. Anzeiger Iv. p. 38. The reading -tes I owe to a kind communication of von Planta who has seen the helmet. If the 3 before $f \in \sigma \tau t e s$ is the name of the giver's father, it follows the Volscian and Umbrian not the Oscan order: v. Bücheler Rh. Mus. xxxix. 1884 p. 559.

Fab. 2890 bis, Zvet. Osc. 154, tab. xviii. 13. F. followed a forged duplicate.
${ }^{1}$ For the history of Vibo and the Bruttians v. Grote, Gr. Hist. x. p. 287, C. I. L. x. p. 7; also Note i. p. 4 inf. and the Remark p. 15 f. The town was held by the Oscan-speaking Bruttians (a rebellious off-shoot of the Lucanians) from 356 to about 330 b.c., and from about 290 till it became a Latin colony in either 239 or 192 в.с.

7 Place of discovery uncertain, now in the Antikenkabinet, Vienna: first published by Bücheler (Rh. Mus. xxxix. (1884), p. 558), whose text I follow, except in the order of the lines, which is Deecke's (apud Zvet. Inscr. It. Infer. p. 184).

## $\sigma \pi \epsilon \delta \iota \varsigma \mu \alpha \mu \epsilon \rho \epsilon \kappa \iota \epsilon \mathrm{S} \mid \sigma \alpha \iota \pi \iota \nu \mathrm{S} \alpha \nu a S a \kappa \in \tau$

On the lower edge of a bronze helmet without visor or strap. Ion. aß, retrograde, roughly engraved, with : between the words. The second line is written above the first, and hence Biich. and Bréal read them in the converse order. But 1.2 is the shorter by two or three letters and may well have been written after the other. The $S$, which is faint, I read as $f$ (whereas $\sigma$ is 3) as in no. 6.

Zvet. It. Infer. 247, Deecke 1. c., Buich. 1. c., who compares Liv. 10. 44 (the taking of Saepinum in 293 B.C.) ; for the names Spedius and Mamercius v. inf. 12 c, 27 в, etc.

8-10 On tiles found in Monteleone ; 8-10 were formerly in the Capialbi Museum, first (correctly) published in U.D. p. 192; 10 bis is from Kaibel 2402. 1.

| 8 | котteiךls | 9 | коттєı | 10 | котт८ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 10 bis optinus |  |  |  |  |

Ion. $a \beta$, deeply stamped, 8 from left to right, the other three retrograde; in $8 \mathrm{C}=\sigma$ as in the Osco-Greek insc. of Lacco (p. 84 inf .), and in 14, $15,29 \mathrm{inf}$. With them were other tiles with Oscan names in Greek inflexion,
 and $\mu a \rho a \iota . v \sigma . \rho$. from left to right with C. This cursive form occurs also beside ₹ (under the glaze) on an Attic or Geloan vase of the 5th cent. b.c. (see P. Gardner, Catal. Gr. Vases in Ashmolean Museum, Oxford no. 266).

Fabr. 3035-3040, Mommsen l.c., Kaibel l.c., Zvet. Osc. p. 82.
Note 1. On the coin-legends of Vibo. The bronze coins from Bivona (Vibo) which have the legends [EI, [E|П in Tar.-Ion. a $\beta$ (Mom. U. D. p. 201, Friedl. Osk. Münz. p. 61, Zvet. Osc. 184) are classed by Head (Hist. Num. p. 85) as Greek coins earlier than those with $\epsilon i \pi \omega \nu \iota \epsilon \omega$, and I see no reason for regarding them as Oscan. Friedländer did so with some hesitation, because of the absence of [ in the later legends, but in the tables of Heraklea (G. Meyer, Griech. Gram. ${ }^{2} \S 230$, Roberts, Greek Epigraphy p. 271) we find the sound was disappearing at least in Tarentine Greek towards the end of the 4th century b.c. and it may well have done the same in the (Locrian or Syracusan?) dialect of Vibo. We have oculajas with no digamma in an insc. from Locri Epizephyrii
itself (Roehl I. G. d. 537), dating from the 4th century (Roberts p. 242). Now the coins with [ are dated by Head from 379 to 350 B.c., the rest from $330-296$. It is very unlikely that the former should have been issued by the barbarous Lucanians in their first tenure of the city from about 350-330 в.c., especially as the types are thoroughly Greek and recur with little variation in the later set of coins.

Note ii. C. I. X. x. 8041, 59 may possibly be Oscan.

## HiHAH? hann

It is on a tile found among the rubbish of the temple of Cybele, 6 miles from Monteleone in the vico Papaglione.

## 11 Place-names ${ }^{1}$ of the Bruttif ${ }^{2}$.

A. Well-attested (in form, date and locality).

Bruttrii, Brittii both inscc. cl. (often with a single $t$ in mss.), $\beta \rho \in \tau \tau \tau$ nmm.; for the alleged etyma v. infr. no. 25 A. Brutates Enn. ap. Fest. Müll. p. 35, Lucil. ap. Porphyr. ad Hor. Sat. 1. 10. 30. Bruttius ager (not Bruttium), Brittianus (Brutt-), cl.
İălı̆a, -lus, -lĭcus cl. inscc. (cf. e.g. Arist. Pol. 4 [7]. 10 and the Osc. form of the name 199 ff .) and
Oenōtrǐa,-tri cl. were both originally $=$ Bruttium, or parts of it, cf. Momm. Hist. Rom. (Eng. trans.) i. 440, Nissen, Ital. Landeskunde, p. 60 and the full reff. given by Grote iII. p. 349 n.

Hălex, $-\eta \xi$ masc. fl. Stra. 6. 1. 9 (who makes it the boundary between Regium and Locri) al., cf. Punta dell' Alice, but this is N. of Croton, corresponding to Strabo's K $\rho i \mu \iota \sigma \sigma \alpha$ äкра.
[Leucopetra, also called Petra cl.]
Rēgium, -ini, Regia Columna cl. inscc., cf. 186 D inf. Réggio.
Scyllaeum prom. et opp. cl.
[Zephyrium prom., Locri Epizephyrii cl. nm.]
Acheron fl. cl. (nom. Acheros Liv. 8. 24 ; a quo oppidani Acheruntini Pl. 3. 5. 73 ?).
Medma or Medama Pl. 3. 5. 74 al., Mesma Steph. Byz. Mє $\delta \mu a \iota \nu$ $M_{\epsilon \sigma \mu a \iota \omega \nu} \mathrm{~nm}$. (cir. 340 b.c.). Head, Hist. Num. p. 89. Mésinza f. Síla (silva) cl. Síla.
${ }^{1}$ For the arrangement and notation see the List of Signs and Abbreviations.

- The tables of the Itineraries through the Bruttii are given C. I. L. x. p. 1-2.

Tauriana, -ani cl. insce. ef. Momms. ad C. I. L. x. 104.
Caulon prom., Kav入 $\begin{aligned} & \text { via opp., cl. ( } \pi \rho o ́ t e \rho o \nu ~ A u ̀ \lambda \omega \nu i a ́ a ~ S t r a . ~ 6 . ~ 2 . ~ 10) . ~\end{aligned}$
Sagra fem. fl. cl.
[Herculis portus cl.]
[Ithacesiae insulae cl.]
Vibo, onenses cl. Gr. 'Intávıov, but nm. Fetr-, $\epsilon i \pi-\mathrm{v}$. Note i. supr. and Mom. C. I. L. x. p. 7. Bivóna.
[Valentia,-tini cl. inscc.; the two names are often used together, Vibo Valentia].
 Stra. 6. 1. 10 al. Scy̆lăcêum Verg. Aen. 3. 553 al. Squilläce.
 калои̃ $\sigma \iota$ Stra. 6. 1. 5).
Terina Pl. 3. 5. 72 al. Tepiva Stra. 6. 1. 5, $\tau \in \rho \iota \nu a, ~ \tau \epsilon \rho \epsilon \iota \mathrm{~nm}$. in Achaean aß, Head Hist. Num. p. 96, Imhoof-Blumer, Numism. Zeitschr. Vienna 1886, p. 229. Nöcera Tirinése.
Lăcīnĭum prom., Juno Lacinia, cl.
Aesărus fl. Stra. 6. 1. 12 al. ( $-\bar{a} \rho o s$, Theocr. 4. 17, -ăris Ov. Met. 15. 22, adj. -ăreus ib. 15. 54).

Crǒtō, -ōnienses, -oniates cl. (an Iapygian towu, Stra. 6. 1.11-12). Ootróne.
Clampetia, -tianus cl. e.g. Liv. 29. 38.
Consentia, -tinus cl., Cos- C. I. L. x. 6950, cf. the di Consentes. Cosénza.
Pandosia (-8oria) cl. e.g. Liv. 8. 24.
N $\mathfrak{a} a \iota \theta$ os f. Theorr. 4. 24 al. Néto $f$.
Pětēlĭa, -lini cl. inscc. Petilia Policástro.
\{Thūř̆i cl. inscc. Also called (by the Romans)
Copiae Stra. 6. 1. 13 al.
Crāthis fl. cl. Crátif.
Sybaris fl. et opp., -ritani cl.
इкíopos,-pavós cl. e.g. Herodt. 6. 21.
Muranum C. I. L. ix. 6950. Moráno Cálabro.
Cěrillae Sil. 8. 579 al. K $\mathfrak{p} \rho \lambda \lambda$ oc Stra. Cirella.
B. Less certain.
['H $\rho a \kappa \lambda \epsilon \hat{i} 0 \nu$ the southernmost prom. of Italy stra. 6. 1.]
Cenus prom. Pl. 3. 5. 73 Kaìvs Stra. 6. 1. 5.

Kalkivos fl. cl. e.g. Thuc. 3. 103, Paus. 6. 6. 4. Is this the same as Carcinus fl. Pl. 3. 10. 96, Carcine urbs, sinus Carcinites, Mela 2. 4. 8? Add Kaukivps o.... (gloss lost) Hesych.

Cocintus (KóкvขӨos) Pl. 3. 5. 43 al.
${ }^{\text {' }}$ ' $\lambda i$ ias $^{5}$ f. Thuc. 7. 35, apparently the N. boundary of Croton.
"A $\beta \rho v \sigma \tau o v$ Ptol. 3. 1. 66. Aprustani Pl. 3. 11. 98. ? Argusto.
Teuranus ager S. C. de Bacc. C. I. L. x. 104 ubi v. Mommsen.
? Tiriö́lo.
 7. 9 al. l'Amáto (V.) and Laméto (Diz. Corog.). Also called Narntivos кó̀ $\pi$ os v . sub C.
Lagaria Stra. 6. 1. 14, -rinum (uinum) Pl. 14. 6. 69.
Nerulum, -lonensis Liv. 9. 20 al.
Mustiae Pl. 3. 10. 95, Mela 2. 4. 8, $\mu v, \mu \nu \sigma$ nm. Head p. 89, cf. 'Y $\mathrm{Y} \omega \rho \rho \boldsymbol{\nu}$ inf. C.

## C. Doubtful.

' $\Upsilon \pi \omega \rho o \nu$ ? $v \pi \omega \rho$ on joint coins of this town and Mustiae ( $\mu v-v \pi \omega \rho$ ) Head p. 89; Hipporum Itin. Ant. p. 115 Wess.
Малє́ $\rho т \iota \frac{1}{}$ Stra. 6. 1. 9, cf. 4 sup.
Tauroentum ? Pl. 3. 5. 73. ?=Tauriana in A sup.
Orestis portus Plin. ibid.
Baletum fl. Plin. 3. 5. 72.
$\left.\begin{array}{l}\text { ? Theseunti Tauriani } \\ \text { ? Pecolus fl. }\end{array}\right\}$ Cato ap. Prob. ad Verg. Buc. p. 4 Keil.
'E $\sigma \omega \pi \iota \iota$ Strab. 6. 2. 7.
Metaurus fi.? Plin. 3. 5. 73, Stra. 6. 1. 5. ? Marro f. (K.).
ad Mallias It. Ant. p. 106.
Nicotera It. Ant. pp. 106, 111. Nicótéřa.
Semirus fl. Plin. 3. 10. 96. Simmarif. (K.).
Bulotus (al. Buthr-) fl. Liv. 29. 7.
Arogas (alii Arocha) Plin. 3. 10. 96.
Baesidiae Liv. 30. 19, ? Báóı̧̌a, Polyb. ap. Steph. Byzant. s.v.
Angitula It. Ant. p. 106. Angittla $f$.

Tacina fl.? It. Ant. p. 114. Tâcina f. (K.).
Sabatus fi. 1t. Ant. pp. 105, 110. ? Savato f.
K $\rho i \mu \iota \sigma \sigma a$ äк $\rho a$ Stra. 6. 1. 3, Steph. Byzant.

Capraseae Itinn.
Traens fl. Diod. Sic. 12.22 (acc. Tpáevta). Trionti f. (K.).
'Eлé $\pi$ oopov fl. Polyaenus 5. 3. 2. ' $\mathrm{E} \lambda \lambda \epsilon \pi-,-\epsilon \sigma \pi-$, mss. of Polyb. 1. 6.2 g. ?Callipari f. (K.).

Ku入ıбтápvov rávos? f. near the Siris, Lycophr. 595.
Clibanus mons Pl. 3 § 96.
$\Lambda a ́ \tau v \mu \nu o \nu$ öpos Theocr. 4. 19 and Schol. ad loc.
$\Sigma \tau о \mu \dot{\alpha} \lambda \iota \mu \nu 0 \nu$ Theocr. 4. 23.
'A $\rho i ́ \nu \theta \eta \pi$ đò̀ıs Oivát $\rho \omega \nu$ Hecat. ap. Steph. Byz. Arinthaeus occurs as a soldier's name in the 4 th Cent. A.D. But cf. Note xviii. p. 148 inf .

"Е $\rho \iota \mu$ оу
'I $\xi$ 'ias (cf. 'Iria Diod. Sic. 37. 2. 13)
Meveкívך
Kขтє́pıov
Ma入ávios
Nívala
Kó $\sigma \sigma \boldsymbol{a}$ (?=Cosae in Etruria)
$\Phi o \iota \beta i ́ a$ 4th century (в.c.) name of a part of Regium Stra. 6. 1.6 ad fin.
'Povaкía Procop. B. Goth. 3. 28-30 al. Roscianum It. Ant. p. 114. ? Rossáno.
Rōměchǐum Ov. Metam, 15. 705, cf. Dict. Geogr. s.v.
Batum fl. Plin. 3 § 72.
Babia Plin. 14 § 69.
[Dioscoron, Calypsus, Meloessa, Eranusa] and Tiris islands off Cape Lacinium Pl. 3 § 96.
Aufugum? Liv. 30. 19.
Argentanum $i b$.
Vergae? ib.
Lymphaeum ib.
Ocriculum ib.
Ser...nm. of Achaean standard with Achaean a $\beta$, probably Bruttian, Head p. 98. Seruitianum uinum in Plin. $14 \S 69$ may come from Bruttium.
Paternum
Succeianum
Subseciuum $\}$ It. Ant. p. 114-5.
Altanum
[Decastadium]

## D. Further modern names.

Alénto $f$. (K.), Gëráce, Melicuıcca, Catanzáro, Ciro, Cariäti, S. Benedétto ưlláno, Coscíle f.

12 Personal names ${ }^{1}$ of the Bruttil.
A. Frequent.

1. Nomina.
gens Aurelia
Caesia
Iulia
2. Cognomen. Rufus
B. Less frequent.
3. Nomina.

| gens Acerronia | Crittia (g) | Minucia | Sestia |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Atilia Fabia | Nonia | Staia (inf.) |  |
| Caecilia ( $g, l$ ) | Flauia | Numisia (sup.) | Suallia |
| Caerellia | Futia | Numōnia (g) | Titia |
| Caluia | Lollia | Octauia | Turillia? |
| Cincia | Maria | Pullia | Vagellia |
| Claudia | Meconia (Meg.) | Satria (inf.) | Varia |
| Cornelia | Minicia | Segulia | Vettia (g, l,inf.) |

2. Among the Cognomina may be mentioned:

$$
\text { Minatus ( } g \text {, inf. })
$$

${ }^{1}$ For the arrangement and notation see the List of Signs and Abbreviations. ('Frequent' $=$ more than 5 times; 'less frequent' $=5$ times or less, but more than once.)
${ }^{2}$ From C. I. L. x. $1-125,8041,8074-88,8330,8422$, and the inscc. on tiles etc. given in 8051 ff., and Kaibel, I. G. Sic. et It. 617-644, 2400-02. The list does not include any names but such as occur in these authorities from this area, but if any of these are found also in the preceding dialectic inscriptions, (sup.) is here added; (inf.) denotes that the name occurs in some dialect-inscription elsewhere; names showing possibly or certainly dialectic (i.e. non-Jatin) characteristics are here underlined.

## C. Occurving only once in the district.



## C. Lucania.

The Lucanians were a southern branch of the Samnite stock. They first appear in history about 390 B.c. when they were at war with the Greeks of Thurii and captured Laus and Paestum, the Italiot league being reconstructed to resist them (Diod. 14. 101, Stra. p. 251 ). Their communal coins (23) and their action as a single tribe in the wars of the IV and III centuries b.c. show that they formed a united confederacy or canton like other Samnite tribes (Hirpini, Frentani etc.). We know from Strabo (6. 1. 3, p. 254) that they had a democratic constitution save in time of war when a special $\beta a \sigma i \lambda \epsilon \dot{\nu}$ s or Dictator was chosen from among the regular magistrates. The tribe allied with Rome in 298 b.c. (Liv. 10. 11 f.), and we find. a cohort of Lucanians serving in the army soon after (id. 10. 33). But in the Hannibalic war the towns went different ways, and hereafter dealt with Rome singly. Strabo remarks that in his own day ( 66 B.C. -21 A.D.) they had all 'become Romans,' that is to say they spoke Latiu.

None of the inscc, in Greek $a \beta$ which follow can be older than 400 B.C., if only because the Ionic characters in which they are written were not established (at Tarentum) before then (cf. Head pp. 45-6, Roberts p. 271); and it is scarcely probable that individual Lucaniansfor 13,17 and 22 seem private inscc.-would have learnt to use Greek characters of any kind before the end of the first quarter or half of the IV century. It is equally impossible to fix narrowly a lower limit of date, but it seems unlikely that the Greek aß was used by Lucanians after the Hannibalic war. Roman influence had by that time been long supreme in their territory (e.g. Venusia 291 b.c., Paestum 273, Tarentum 272), and had probably even then established the use of the Roman alphabet which we find in 18-21 and at Bantia (28).

The little that is known of Potentia, Tegianum (Diano) and Anxia may be sought in C. I. L. x. pp. 21, 33 and 25 (with Roehl I. G. A. 547) respectively.

## 13-22 Lucanian Inscriptions.

13 Preserved only in two copies of a stone fragment found near the fountain of S. Giovanni close to Diano, by Mannelli in a ms. work (Lucania Sconosciuta, r. p. 94 and in an appendix of inscc. from Diano at the end of vol. ri.) dated 1792 now in the Naples Museum where I saw it in 1894. First published by Macchiaroli, Diano, p. 271 (Naples, 1868).

Mannelli states that the stone is a fragment, representing it as broken at both ends but some way outside the letters. It measured 79 m . by 53 ( 31 in . by 21 ). Tar.-Ion. $\alpha \beta$, from left to right. Mannelli's two copies are not exactly alike, the first omits the initial $a$, the $\quad$ of ontes and the (single) interpunct which in the other is only wanting after $a$; both give a line of dots after $\pi \iota \omega$ as though a vertical were lost. $\pi \pi \kappa F \iota \eta \iota s$ would be the common form of the name, $v$. the Glossary. Büch. ${ }^{1}$ would add $\phi$ to the last word. On the use of $o$ and $\omega, v$. note to the table of Alphabets, Part II A.

Buich. Jena Litterat.-Zeitung 1874, p. 610 where Corssen's account (Eph. Epigr. II. p. 153) is roughly handled. Zvet. Osc. 144 tab. xviii. $10 a$ and $b$

14-16 Copied by Helbig from plaster casts taken by Sign. M. Lacava from broken stones built into the wall of the church S. Maria di Rossano at Vaglio near Potenza. Bullett. Inst. Arch. Rom. 1881, p. 205.


Tar.-Ion. $a \beta$ from left to right with $C=\sigma$ in 14 and 15 (cf. 8 supr.) but § in 16: 14 and 16 have each a single interpunct as shown above. 16 the remnant of $a$ might be the last stroke of $\lambda$ or $\mu$. With these fragments is another, $\mu \omega \nu \omega \mu \mu \epsilon$, with uncial $\omega$. Zvet. Ital. Inf. Dial. 233-5.

17 Formerly at Fermo in a private collection of S. de Minicis who bought it in Naples, and sent copies to Mommsen. Now lost.

$$
h \in \rho \in \kappa \lambda \epsilon \iota \leq \quad \sigma \kappa|\lambda a \beta \in \underline{\nu} \underline{S}| \|
$$

[^2]On a small cylinder of clay serving as a base for a clay ball which has two clubs clearly painted in black one on each side: was it a draughtsman (latrunculus)? They were often made of earthenware, and of various patterns. Tar.-Ion. $a \beta$, from left to right, with $\vdash=h, \Sigma=\sigma$, without interpunct. The $\iota$ of 1.1 is ' on Min.'s first copy, $ך$ on his second. In 1. 2 Min.'s second copy gave $\delta$ for $\lambda$ (if the preceding $\sigma \kappa$ are part of the same word $\lambda$ is clearly preferable) and $\kappa \iota$ for $\nu$. The $a \beta$ shows that the insc. must come from S. Italy.

Momms. U. D. p. 191, tab. xii. 35, whence Fabr. 2847, and Zvet. Osc. 153.

8-21 On four small brass plates bought from a collection of antiquities in the Basilicata (=Lucania), now in the Museum at Turin. First published by Fabretti, 1864, and quoted by Mom. C. I. L. x. 501.

## 18 Ov Afaries $0 v$ <br> 19 N Maraies N

## 20 C Soies Min <br> 21 0v Caisidis 0v

Lat. $a \beta$, with regular interpuncts. On the back of 21 and on two other plates respectively are Tr. Platorius Tr., No. Comni. No. (which in Oscan fashion omit filius; is Comni for Osc. -nis, -nies or Lat -nius?) and $L$. Villius V. $f$.

Mommsen in Gerhard's Archäol. Anzeiger (Beiblatt of his Zeitung) 1865, p. 82 compares them with similar name-tablets from Euboea (Roehl I. G. A. 372, Roberts Gr. Epigr. 169), without expressing an opinion as to their purpose. Zvet. Osc. 155-9, Fabr. Corp. Inscc. It. Gloss. col. 1681.

## 22 Titulus Anxianus:

Found in 1846, half a mile S.E. of Anzi; first published by Lombardi, Mem. dell' Inst. Arch., r. p. 231, and then by Mommsen, U. D. p. 191, tab. xii. 36. Now lost, except for a rumour that it is somewhere in Paris.

$$
\pi \omega \tau \quad F_{o} \lambda\left|\lambda_{0} h \omega \mu \quad \sigma o \rho \circ\right| F \omega \mu \quad \epsilon \iota \nu \quad \kappa \alpha \pi \iota \delta \iota \tau \mid \omega \mu
$$

 $\epsilon \sigma \circ \tau \beta \rho a \tau \omega \mu \mu \epsilon \iota \alpha \iota \alpha \nu \alpha .$.
Finely engraved on a triangular fastigium of stone with the two lower corners broken off; the sides when complete were about $16 \frac{3}{4} \mathrm{in}$., the base about $26 \frac{1}{4} \mathrm{in}$. long $={ }^{\circ} 417 \mathrm{~m}$. and 659 m .; underneath is left the summit of the head of a youthful,
probably male figure, carved in high relief. "It appears to be a fragment of an dedicula such as we have in many Campanian tombstones [e.g. C. I. L. x. 4266, 4321], with the epitaph in the tympanum and beneath on the body of the stone a fulllength figure of the dead, between pillars; but...since there are no other Samnite tombstones it may perhaps rather be part of a temple or shrine." Momms. l.c. Now however tombstones have appearcd even in Samnium, see p. 105 inf.

Tar.-Ion. $a \beta$, from left to right, with $A, \vdash,\lceil, P,\{$ etc.; for the use of $o$ and $\omega$ see Note to the Table of Alphabets; interpunct after the 2 nd and 5 th words only. 1. 5 init. has lost one large or two small letters. 1. 6 only the last stroke of the $\underline{\mu}$ and the first of the $\boldsymbol{a}$ are left, so that either of them may have been $\lambda$ or $\mu$.

Corssen Kuhn's Zeitsch. xvili., pp. 161 and 241, Büch. Rh. Mus. 1875, p. 446 ; Bugge and Deecke, whose views are now coloured by Etruscan, have written on the insc. in Bezz. Beitr. x., p. 114, and in the Appendix to Zvet. Inscc. It. Infer. no. 26 respectively. Büch. (Rh. Mus. 1878, p. 281) proposed to scan it as a Saturnian!
U. D. 1. c., Zvet. Osc. 143, Fabr. 2903.

## 23-24 Lucanian Coins.

## 23 <br> $\lambda о v к а \nu о \mu$

Bronze coins with head of Ares helmeted) (Pallas or Bellona with shield and spear point downwards; dated by Head along with the Bruttian bronze coinage from about 300 to 203 b.c., cf. also Momms. U. D. p. 112. Friedl. Osk. M. p. 57. Head, Historia Numorum p. 57. Poole, Catal. Gr. Coins Br. Mus. p. 224. Cf. also the letters $\lambda v, \lambda v k$ on silver coins of Metapontum after its capture by the Lucanians about 300 B.c., Head ib. p. 55. U. D. p. 204. Zvet. Osc. 183.

24 Paestum (Poseidonia till its capture by Lucanians circ. 390 в.c.).

## $\pi \alpha \iota \sigma \tau \alpha \nu о$

Ion. $\alpha \beta$, left to right; the silver stater has $S$ the bronze coins $\{$; в.c. 300-268, issued either by Lucanians or by the Roman colony founded in
B.C. 273 ; for types etc. v. Head p. 68, Poole p. 274, Mommsen-Blacas, Monnaie Romaine I. p. 149 f.; for the form see Note xvi (to katrravo no. 146 infra).

Note iii. The bronze coins of Laus of the 4th centary b.c. (Head p. 61 f.) with legends in Ion. $a \beta$, besides the regular $\lambda a \iota \nu \omega \nu$ or $\lambda a$, show abbreviated names which no deubt are those of magistrates, some of which may be of Oscan origin: v. Head, l.c. and cf. Friedländer, Osk. M. p. 57. These are
a. $\Sigma \Gamma \mathrm{E} \Lambda \ldots(? \sigma \pi \epsilon \delta-\iota \circ) . \quad$ b. $\mu \iota \beta \in$ (? Minius Bennius).
c. ко $\mu$ (? Comonus, or Comnus Mummius).
d. $\sigma \tau \alpha$ o४८ (? Statius Opsidius). e. $F \iota \beta \iota$ (? Vibius).
(e) is fairly clear on a coin in the Berlin Königl. Kabinet, to judge from an impression which I owe to the kindness of Dr Dressel. The Brit. Museum specimen of the same coin (Head p. 61, Poole p. 237) has been generally read EYBI, but Mr Head tells me it is not in good condition and might well be [IBI.
On the impression there appears a slight stroke to the right of the first । ( $I^{\prime}$ ) but it seems to be really part of the wreath which separates the two syllables.

## 25 Lucanian Gloss.

## A. Gloss whose form and dialect is well-attested.

## 








Remark. From these notices combined with the Iapygian origin of Croton ( $\mathbf{1 1}$ A sup.) and the likeness between the names Metapontum and Messapii Mommsen concluded (U.D. p. 97) that the Bruttii were a branch of the Iapyges; and that this tribe (including the Messapii, Sallentini, Poedicnli, Peucetii, and Daunii) originally covered the whole of S. Italy, but were pushed into its extremities by Samnite tribes (Hirpini, Apuli, Lucani) who subdued the ancestors of the Bruttians (hence ' $\delta$ ov' hous') and made them speak their language. This he supported by interesting evidence (especially Aristot. Pol. 4 [7]. 10)
showing that the Bruttii like the Iapyges proper, were a kind of barbarous or pre-Hellenic Greeks.

Against this Helbig (Hermes xi. p. 257 ff. Bull. Inst. Arch. Rom. 1884 p. 155 ff .) has urged with reason that the flat, fertile plains of the S.E. corner of the peninsula were no safe refuge for a defeated people, and that some of the names in the Iapygian district are found also in purely Italic territory (Aufidus, Anxa, Norba). Hence, while admitting that the Iapygians probably pushed their conquest as far as the Western side of the Gulf of Tarentum and the valleys that run into it, he holds that even in Iapygia itself they were not aborigines but invaders who had dispossessed an earlier genuinely Italic population (the Siculi). The power which they exercised accounts for the absence of Greek colonies on the coast of Italy that lay nearest to Greece ; we have actually on record (e.g. Hdt. 7. 170) a terrible defeat inflicted by the Messapians on the Tarentines in 473 в.c. Further it is abundantly clear from tradition (e.g. Paul. Fest. 69 M.), and from numerous coincidences in names both of places (e.g. 'Iá $\pi v \gamma \epsilon s, \mathbf{X} \hat{\omega} \nu \in s$, (ienusia, Sallentini, Calabri, the endings -ntum, -etum, etc.) and persons that the Iapygians came from the Illyrian coast and came by sea, and that they had established themselves in Lapygia at all events before the foundation of Rhegion in 743 b.c. Pauli has shown too that detachments of the same tribes settled in the East of central Italy (e.g. the Liburni of Picenum and the Iapuzkum numen who are warned off the Iguvine sacrifices 358 inf .) and on the North coast of the Adriatic (the Veneti); see Die Venetern und ihre Schriftdenkmäler, Altital. Forschungen iII. Leipzig 1891, p. 413 fi., where he gives a succinct and convincing account of the question so far as it can be determined by the evidence we as yet possess. Professor Ridgeway points out to me further that according to Steph. Byz. (s. v. xiou, quoted Grote iII. p. 347) the serfs of Magna Graecia were called Ménaryot, which in itself proves that the folk the Greeks conquered were not Iapygian.

The Bruttii therefore were distinct from the Iapygians, but the evidence of Strabo and Diodorus shows that they had been subdued by the Lucanians and moved further South. What their own name for themselves had been before that (Itali, Oenotri, Siceli, Pelasgi?) must be left for further research to determine.

## 26 Place-names ${ }^{1}$ of Lucania?.

## A. Well-attested (in form, date and locality).

Lūcāni cl. inscc. $\Lambda \in \cup \kappa a \nu \circ$ í, but nm. Gr. גuкcavav Osc. 入ovk- Head Hist. Num. p. 57, v. 23 sup. (*Lucus -a -um only in the phrase bos Luca) ; 'a Samnitibus orti duce Lucio' Plin. 3. 5. 71.
Oenōtri, -trii see 11 A . sup.
${ }^{1}$ For the arrangement and the meaning of the signs $v$. the list of Signs and Abbreviations.
${ }^{2}$ The tables of the Itineraries in Lucania are given C. I. L. x. pp. 1-2.

Laus (Aãos) fl. et opp. cl. cf. Note iii. sup. Lao f.
Blanda cl. insc.
[Heraclea, -ia ('Нра́клєєa), -cleensis, -cleotes cl. inscc.]
Aciris fl. Tab. Heracl. (Kaibel 645) passim, Stra. 6. 1. 14 al. Agrif.
 тєроу кєк $\lambda \bar{\eta} \sigma \theta a \iota$ M $\varepsilon$ 'raßov Stra. 6.1.15 and other authorities). Metopónto.
Grumentum, -tinus cl.
Buxentum ( $\Pi v \xi \circ \hat{v} \varsigma$ ), -entini cl. inscc.
Siris fl. et opp., -rini, - $\hat{\imath} \tau a \ell$, cl. (e.g. Herodt. 8.62), nm. (Head Hist. Num. p. 69 with $\sigma \iota \rho \iota v a s$ on one side and $\pi v \xi$ oєs on the other).
Pălĭnūrus prom. cl. Palinúro.
Vělĭa ('Yé $\eta \eta$, later 'E入éa, cf. also *Heles fl. B inf.), -iensis cl. inscc. Vělīnus adj. Verg. Aen. 6. 366.
 ix. p. 52. Pésto.

Leucǒsǐa insula (-cŏs-Ov. Sil., -к $\omega \sigma$ - Stra.) cl. (1Leucothea Plin. e.g. 3. 6. 83). ?Capo Licósa.

Tegianum, -nensis inscc. (?Tergilani Plin. 3. 11.98). Teggiäno.
Atina, -ates Plin. 3. 11. 98 al., inscc. Atena.
Eburum, -rinus Plin. 3. 11. 98 al., C. I. L. x. 451. Éboli.
Volcei, -ceientes-ceianus cl. inscc. Buccino.
Potentia, -entinus cl. inscc. Poténza.
Numistro,-strani cl. e.g. Liv. 27. 2.
Alburnus mons Verg. G. 3. 146, -nus portus Lucil. ap. Prob. ad loc., Serv. ib., al. Cluverius It. Ant. 4. c. 14 vouches for the name Alfurno as locally used of ruins on the left bank of the Silarus 3 miles from its mouth. Tertull. Apol. 5 speaks of a deus Alburnus, worshipped by a M. Aemilius (?) without the consent of the Senate.
For Venusia see 33 A.

## B. Less certain.

$\mathbf{X} \dot{\omega} \nu \eta, \mathbf{X} \hat{\omega} \nu \in \varsigma$, the oldest name of the distriet according to Strabo, e.g. 6. 1. 2 and Aristot. Pol. iv. [vii.] 10 ; cf. 25 A. Rem.

Ursentini Pl. 3. 11. 98, Opбavrıע 1 nm. Fabr. 2911, Head Hist. Num. p. 75.

Morgetes Mópyqтєs Plin. 3. 5. 71, Stra. 6. 1. 6 al. (the reputed founders of Murgentia (cl.) in Sicily).
Consilinum? Lib. Colon. p. 209, v. Momms. C. I. L. x. p. 25. ?Sála Consitína.

Tanager f. Verg. G. 3. 151 al. Tanágro (Vögel) Négro (Kiepert) $f$. Lagonégro (a village, Postal Dict.).
*Heles, acc. -etem, f. near Velia Cic. Fam. 7. 20. 1, Att. 16. 7. 5 ;
Stra. 6. 1. 1 mentions $\kappa \rho \eta \dot{\nu} \eta \tau \iota s$ from which some called Velia ${ }^{\text {"E }} \lambda \eta \eta$ (acc.
"E $\lambda \eta \nu$, gen. "E $\lambda \eta s$ ).
Thebae Cato ap. Plin. 3 § 98, and Steph. Byz., cf. Te banus pagus in Beneventum, 160 B.
Fundi of Volcei, in C. I. L. x. 407 :
Auricus, Ciceralis, Maceriatus, Venatrinus, Visolitanus.
Pagi of Volcei, ibid.:
Forensis, Naranus, Trasamunc..., Aeq....
[Nares Lucanae Sall. Fragm. Hist. p. 88 Dietsch. Itinn.]

## C. Doubtful.

[ $\Delta$ ра́коутоs iєpòv Stra. 6. 1.1.]
Lavinium (on the river Laus v. A supr.) Itinn. (but Plin. 3. 5. 72 Laus amnis, fuit et oppidum eodem nomine), cf. Keller, Lat. Volksetym. p. 13. Laíno.

Lollianus, Percennianus, Q[u]aesicianus, Statuleianus, fundi in C. I. L. x. 444.
Semuncla It. Ant. p. 104.
Casuentum fl. Pl. 3. 11. 97. ? Basiénto f. (K.).
Acalandrum Stra. 6. 3. 4 al. TSalándra.
Kàa $\sigma$ á $\rho \nu a$ ? Stra. 6. 1. 3, (alii Acalandra, as in 6. 3.4).
Oủeptîvaし Stra. 6. 1. 3.
Fugifulae Liv. 24. 20.
Orbitanium ibid.
[Veteres Campi Liv. 25. 16 ad fin.]
Calor fl. Itinn. Calôre f.
Sontini Pl. 3. 11. 98.
Melpes? fl. Plin. 3. 5. 72.
ad Semnum Tab. Peut.? Sínnif.
Anxia Tab. P. Ánzi.
Acerronia? Tab. Peut., An. Rav. 4. 32.
Balabo mons Tab, Peut. ?Balváno.
Moגíєlov mythical name of Siris, Stra. 6. 1, 14.

Pandosia stated by Plut. Pyrrh. 26 to lie between Heraclea and the Siris may be a mere error in describing the site of the Bruttian town of that name.
Pal...? $\quad$ coins of Achaean standard with Achaean $a \beta$, Mol... or Sol...? $\}$ probably Lucanian, 550-500 b.c. Head Hist. Asi...? Num. pp. 69, 75.
D. Further modern names.

Caposele, Valva, Ricigliano, Caggiano, la Polla, Tricarico, Abriola, Laggia, Padula, Viggiano, Sarconi, S. Chirico Raparo, Vatolla, S. Biase, Futani, Ascea, Sapri, Tortora, Ajeta.

27 Personal names ${ }^{1}$ of Lucania?
A. Frequent.

1. Nomina.

| gens Allia | Calpurnia | Iulia | Plaetoria (Ple-) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Annia (inf.) Claudia | Luxilia (Luxsi-) | Pompeia |  |
| Antonia Flauia | Manilia | Tattia |  |
| Arria | Heluia (inf.) | Minatia | Tullia |
| Aurelia Insteia (Ist-) Otacilia | Valeria |  |  |
| Bruttia (Britt-) |  |  |  |

2. Among the Cognomina may be mentioned:

| Bassus | Januarius | Rufus |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Dazimus, Das- (g) | Rufinus |  |

${ }^{1}$ For the arrangement and notation see the List of Signs and Abbreviations.
${ }_{2}$ From C. I. L. x. $126-507,8089-8118,8340 e-8342 b$, etc., I. G. It. Sic. 645-667.

$$
2-2
$$

## B. Less Frequent.

1. Nomina.

| gens Acerronia | Coelia | Maecia | Quelia |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Acilia | Cominia (sup.) | Maecilia | Rufia |
| Aedinia | Cornelia | Magia | Sallustia |
| Aelia | Decimia (-cum-) | Marcia (inf.) | Spedia (inf.) |
| Aemilia | Digitia | Mettia | Staia (inf.) |
| Afaria (inf.) | Dinnia | Nanonia | Statia (sup.) |
| Allidia | Diruitia | Octauia (inf.) | Stremponia |
| Ansia | Equitia | Oppia | Teltonia |
| Appia | Fabia | Ouilonia | Titia |
| Appuleia | Fabricia | Pactumeia | Turcia |
| Aquilia (-illia) | Fadia | Papiria | Vaonia |
| Artoria | Figellia | Petronia | Vettia (inf.) |
| Attia | Gauia (inf.) | Pettia | Vibia (inf.) |
| Auiania | Gellia | Pinaria | Vibiedia (inf.?) |
| Bouiania | Haedinia | Pomponia | Villia |
| Caesia | Hateria | Pontia (inf.) | Vinnia |
| Casinia | Herennia (inf.) | Pontilia | Vintia |
| Ceppia | Iunentia | Popaedia | Viuedia |
| Cincia | Lapillana | Porcatia | Volutia? |
| Clodia | Lucia (inf.) | Postumia |  |

## 2. Among the Cognomina

| Amatistus (i.e. | Cominus (sup.?) | Proculus <br> Amethystus) | Polla |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |

C. Occurring only once in the district.

| gens Accia | Cossonia | Manneia | Sadria |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Aebutia | Cossutia (inf.) | Martia | Satria $\}^{(i n f .)}$ |
| Aesqullia | Curtis | Meneia ? | Sauonia |
| Ahia | Dexia | Meuia | Scalponia 1. |
| Albia | Domitis | Minucia | Sempronia |
| Amdria? | Donnia lib.? | Multasia | Sexstilia, |
| Ampudia | Epidia | Mummia | Stabilia |
| Anneia | Eppia | Naeuia | Statilis |
| Auidia | Fuluia | Nanneia | Stenis ? (sup.) |
| Autronia | Fundania | Nonia (inf.) | Stlaccia |
| Babullia | Gabinia | Numisia (inf.) | Sulpicia |
| Baebia | Gampulaea | Numonia | Traesia |
| Baia | Gruleia | Occia | Vergilia |
| Bennia | Hordionia | Ofilia | Vesonia |
| Bouia | Hostia | Opsia (inf.) | Vibina? |
| Brinnia | Irpinia? | Passienia | Vinicia (inf.) |
| Caecilia | Laberia | Platoria (sup.) | Vipsania |
| Caedial. | Latinia | Plotia | Vitellia (inf.) |
| Caesetia | Laturnia | Porcia | Vlpia |
| Caesidia (inf.) | Licinia | Puculeia ? | Vmbennonia? |
| Caeuia | Lollia | Pullania | Voconia |
| Caia | Luccia | Quintilia | Voluntilia |
| Campusia | Lucretia | Rabilia? | Vtiana? |
| Camurtia | Maesia (inf.) | Rasinia | Vulcacia |
| Cisatia? | Mamia (inf.) | Sabia? (inf.?) |  |

1a. To these may be added:
Tıß. K $\lambda \epsilon ́ \pi \tau \iota o s$ Diod. Sic. 36. 8. 1, 37. 2. 11 Dind.-Müller. Marcus Lamponius (sup.) cl. e.g. App. 1. 40.

## 2. Among the Cognomina

| Asprenas | Herria | Rufilla | Vala |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Birbater <br> Grumentina | Mamia | Mumma |  |

## D. Apulia.

## 1. The District of the Peucetii ${ }^{1}$.

## 28 Tabula Bantina.

A broken bronze tablet found near the site of Bantia in 1793 and now in the Museum at Naples, where I read it in April 1894. Mommsen's (U.D. p. 145) was the first scientific edition.

The fragment is about 15 in . ( 37 m .) broad by 10 ( 25 m .) high, and probably contains about a third of one of the two columns of which the whole inscription consisted. It seems to be broken out of the middle of the left hand column, and traces of the other are visible on the right. The lines contain from 60 to 70 letters each, the variation being no doubt due to the preference for ending the line with a complete word. The inscription is in Latin $a \beta$ (with $A, C, E, G, L, M, N, O$ and $\uparrow$ or $\Gamma=p$ ) and is carelessly, indeed ignorantly, written. There is generally an interpunct in the middle of the line after each
${ }^{1}$ Following Kiepert and Mommsen (C. I. L. IX. p. 43, tab. ii) and the best ancient authorities I have referred Bantia to Apulia, not Lucania, and taken the river Aufidus as the most convenient boundary between the Peucetii and Daunii with Plin. 3. 11. 103, although in 104 he assigns Venusia and Canusium, S. of the Aufidus, to the Daunii; Ptolemy (3.1.63) gives Venusia to the Peucetii and Canusium to the Daunii; I do not understand Beloch's (unexplained) classification (Ital. Bund p. 16) which does not agree with his map, but even Horace (Sat. 2. 1. 34) could not place Venusia and, as Strabo
 v. A puli in 35 A. and ${ }^{5}$ A. Rem.
word, and a blank space of some four or five letters left at the end of each section.

On the back is a fragment of a Latin inscription (C. I. L. I. ${ }^{1}$ 197) written across the bronze in long lines of which the first half is lost. The mutilated paragraphs which it contains come from the end of some Roman law, and state the penalties to be imposed on Roman magistrates for its violation. Since the list of these includes the III viri agris dandis assignandis and these officers were abolished in 118 B.C. (App. B. Civ. 1. 27, confirmed by C. I. L. I. ${ }^{1}$ 200) the law certainly dates from 133118 B.c. The relation between the two sides is difficult to determine, but there can be no doubt that these limits of date are substantially correct for the Oscan inscription also. By that time therefore the Latin $a \beta$ (if not the Latin language) could be read in the South Oscan territory.

The bronze is more carefully levelled on the Latin side, in particular it shows no trace of a junction between the two halves of the plate, but on the Oscan side a rough raised band of metal quite irregular in width and thickness, running down what was once the middle of the plate, seems to be the result of a join and to have forced the engraver of the Oscan to divide it into two columns. The Latin is less closely engraved, and has more room between its letters, lines and paragraphs. Its letters on the whole look to me to have a rather more archaic character than the Oscan ; on the Lat. side (but never on the Oscan) $t$ is several times 「 (which Ritschl Opusc. iv. 699 f. assigns to $150-50$ в.c.); $q$ is Q but on the Osc. Q , the latter being the normal form of the best period ( $90-50$ в.c., Ritschl ib. p. 719), and generally on the Latin side the verticals pass more frequently above and below their normal level ( $\mathrm{A} a, \mathrm{P} a, H h, 1$ and 1 promiscuously for both $i$ and $\imath, \Lambda_{m}, \vee Y u$ ).

Mommsen (ad C. I. L. $\mathrm{I}^{1}{ }^{1}$ 197) holds that the Latin insc. is part of the 'original document of which the Oscan is a translation, namely, a foedus between Rome and Bantia. Now the bad spelling of the Oscan side and also, perhaps, its use of the Latin abbreviation $q$ for the Osc. kvaisstur, seem to show that it was at least engraved in Rome. This is admitted by Kirchhoff (Stadtr. v. Bant. p. 91) who also regards it as a foedus. But he objects to Mommsen's view of the Latin side (ib. p. 92) on the grounds (1) that the Oscan inscription must have been $\begin{aligned} \text { revision of the Bantine constitution, more or less on the model }\end{aligned}$ of the Roman (for similar revisions cf. Liv. 9. 20 with Weissenborn's note) ; (2) that this would not be called haec lex plebeive scitum, a phrase which occurs several times in the Latin; nor (3) be enforced on Roman magistrates by such severe penalties as the Latin prescribes. Hence Kirchhoff concludes that the connexion between the two inscriptions is purely accidental.

Now (1) the character of our inscription appears to me to be established beyond the shadow of a doubt by the variety of its contents, which no smaller
hypothesis than Kirchhoff's will explain. Mommsen thought that the tr. pl. of the last paragraph could not denote a Bantine magistracy, but his attempt to refer it to the Roman tribunes involves an almost impossible translation of the sentence which has been generally and rightly rejected. (2) On the other hand I know of no evidence that a foedus which was binding on Roman magistrates and citizens and sanctioned by the Centuriae could not be called a lex, and there is enough to suggest that towards the end of the Republic the Plebs could sanction treaties as well as the Centuriae (Cic. Balb. § 33, and Suet. Vesp. 8 plebiscita de societate ac foedere, references I owe to Dr J. S. Reid). This objection, therefore, as well as the next, might be met by pressing Mommsen's conjecture as to the occasion of the treaty, namely that its object was to embody the Gracchan legislation (cf. Cic. Rep. 3. 29. 41 Ti. Gracchus sociorum jura neglexit et foedera, and ib. 1.19. 31 foederibus violatis); if so it would need to be enforced on Roman magistrates, and those sections of it at least which contained the agrarian provisions might be called a lex plebeive scitum. But the differences described above between the two sides of the plate, though perhaps too slight to be altogether conclusive, do appear to me to make Kirchhoff 's view (that the relation of the two sides is only accidental) decidedly more probable.

For the date of the Oscan, which on Mommsen's view would be the same as that of the Latin, Kirchhoff gives us the limits $180-90$ b. с., the first because the order of magistracies fixed at Bantia is roughly that which was developed from the Lex Villia Annalis of that year at Rome; the second because the treaty must be earlier than the Social War which gave the Roman franchise to all Italian towns. But even on his showing I think narrower limits may be found. First, 180 b.c. is only a backward limit, while the general similarity of the $\alpha \beta$ in the two inscc. shows that both belong to much the same epoch. The fact that vowels are doubled to denote length once or twice in the Latin but never in the Oscan has indeed been regarded as an indication of an earlier date for the latter, but very little stress can be laid on this, since an engraver could hardly apply a new fashion of spelling to a language of which he was so ignorant. Secondly if the two laws are not contemporaneous, how came the bronze to be used a second time? Clearly, because the earlier of the two had been repealed before, but not very long before, the second was enacted (cf. the relation between the Lex Repetundarum and the Lex Agraria C. I. L. y. ${ }^{1}$ p. 49 ff .) so that the side containing the first law could be turned to the wall on which the tablet was fixed. If then the Oscan were the earlier, it must have been repealed before 118 в.с.; if on the other hand the Latin be the earlier, the Oscan must be later than 133 b.c., but is not likely to be much later than 118 b.c. The difference in the two faces of the bronze, and in the letters, incline me to believe, on the whole, that the Latin was written first ; especially as it is clearly less likely that a bronze once standing in Bantia should have been carried back to Rome (where we may presume the Latin insc. was engraved) and then (for some reason) carried back to Bantia again, than that it was first used in Rome, and that then, in the second place, the constitution of the little town of Bantia was inscribed on its back. In any case our inscription cannot be much later than 118 в.c. nor much earlier than 133, and the balance of what evidence we have is in favour of 118 as the upper limit.
...0.nom.ust izic itu... | ...sua....nus q moltam angitu... 3 [nur... | ......deiuast maimas carneis senateis tangi[nud 4 ampert.... I XL osii..[p]on ioc egmo comparascuster. ппия 5 pis pertemust, p[rut]er pan......... | deiuatud sipus com[e]nei perum dolora mallom, siom ioc comono mais egm[as tovti | 6 cas amnud pan pieisum brateis auti cadeis amnud, inim 7 idic siom dat sena[teis | tanginud maimas carneis pertumum. piei ex comono pertemest, izic eizeic zicel[ei | 8 comono ni hipid.

Pis pocapit post post omo comono hafiest meddis dat

1 All the letters are certain except the it of itu, for which Bui. reads ro; $\mathbf{r}$ and it are equally possible, but $\boldsymbol{u}$ (not 0 ) is clear. About 25 letters are lost at the beginning of the line and about 20 at the end. 2 Bü. reads sva...l...us, $q$ moltam angii, $v . . . m n$. The text given above is clear, except the first a which is doubtful and the [nur] which, with [nud am] and [rut] of the third and fourth lines respectively, were on a fragment now lost but copied by Rosini in 1797. There seems to be a trace of $m$ three letters space after angitu. About 19 letters are lost at the beginning of 1.2 and about 20 after angitu; about 18 at the beginning of 1.3 and about 14 after tangi-, four of which were doubtless -pert as Bü. conjectures. From 6 to 9 letters are lost at the end of the fourth line. Bréal conjectures pertemest. 4 perhaps osid ; the next two letters are hopelessly obliterated. 5 com[e]nei restored from line 21.6 aes apparently panpieisumbrateis and, 8 comononi, without interpuncts, which, however, may have been worn away. 8 Bui. cancels the second post as an error of the engraver's, and corrects hafiest: he and preceding editors take hafiert to be the reading of the bronze, but the $\mathbf{r}$ is very curious and different from the others; the vertical is a shapeless blotch and close to the right of it are three strokes $\equiv$; I believe it is an $\mathbf{r}$ corrected by the graver to s. I believe the $\mathbf{f}$ is an error for $\mathbf{p}$, cf. $*$ fefacid 1.10 and v. Am. Journ. Phil. xi (1890), p. 309. The punct is omitted

9 castrid loufi.. 1 en eituas, factud pous touto deinatuns 10 tanginom deicans *siom dat eizasc idic tangineis | deicum, pod ualaemom touticom tadait ezum, nep fe*facid, pod pis 11 dat eizac egmad $\min [s$ | deiuaid do*lud malud. suae pis 12 contrud ex elct fefacust auti comono hipust, molto etan/to estud: $\mathrm{n} \oplus \oplus$, in suae pis ionc fortis meddis moltaum 13 herest, ampert minstreis aeteis | eituas moltas moltaum licitud.
14 Suae pis pru meddixud altrei castrous auti eituas | zicolom dicust, izic comono ni hipid ne pon op toutad petirupert 15 urust sipus perum dolom / mallom, in trutum zico touto peremust. petiropert neip mais pomtis com preiuatud 16 actud | pruter pam medicatinom didest, in pon posmom con 17 preiuatud urust, eisucen ziculud | zicolom XXX nesimum comonom ni hipid suae pis contrud exeic fefacust, ionc
before meddis. Ad fin. Bü. reads louf[rud] but the $\mathbf{i}$ is quite clear, hence Bréal loufit: the following letter is less like $t$ than $\mathbf{f}$ or $\mathbf{r}$ since the cross stroke is rather low down, and not more than two or three letters, if any, can have been lost at the end of the line. 9 Bréal would alter doiuatuns to deiuatuus though there is no other example in the inscription of vowels doubled to denote length. Bui, would correct to eizaisc. *siom, aes stom, clearly by mistake, and idictangineis. 10 aes ezumnep, and fepacid. All edd. corr. fefacid and 11 docud, all edd. corr. dolud. aes EX•ELG; Bü. corr. exeic from 1. 17. Mommsen thought (U. D. p. 145) the lower stroke of the L due to a slight injury of the bronze. 13 aes prumeddixud and 14 comononi. 15 So Bugge; after pomtis there is a space (of two or three letters) on the bronze; hence Bréal puts the full stop there, with no stop at peremust and a comma after petiropert where Bü. puts the stop. According to the bronze Bréal is right. 16 aes interpunctuates medicat and inom, but omits the mark between pon and posmom, con and preiuatud. 17 aes nihipid and 18 meddismoltaum. 19 aes Sansae tautam

18 suaepis | herest meddis moltaum, licitud, ampert mistreis aeteis eituas licitud.
19 Pon censtur | *Bansae * toutam censazets pis ceus Bantins 20 fust, censamur esuf in eituam, poizad licud \| iuse censtur censaum angetuzet. aut suaepis censtomen nei cebnust 21 dolud mallud | in eizeic uincter, esuf comenei lamatir pr 22 meddixud toutad praesentid perum dolum / mallom, in amiricatud allo famelo in ei siuom, paei eizeis fust, pae 23 ancensto fust, | toutico estud.

Pr suae praefucus pod post exac Bansae fust, sose pis op 24 eizois com | atrud ligud acum herest, auti pru medicatud 25 manim aserum eizazunc egmazum | pas exaiscen ligis scriftas set, ne phim pruhipid mais zicolois $\mathbf{X}$ nesimois. auae pis 26 contrud | exeic pruhipust, molto etanto estud: n ©. in 27 suas pis ionc meddis moltaum herest, licitud | [ampert] minstreis aeteis eituas moltas moltaum licitud.

Pr censtur Bansæ | [ni pis fu]id, nei aure q fust, nep censtur fuid, nei sma pr fust. in suae pis pr in mane | 29 ...............ifi q fut $\dagger$ stacus ${ }^{\text {um }}$ nerum fust, izic post eizuc $\operatorname{tr} \mathrm{pl}$

Bui. corr. 20 aes init. A'SE generally read (or corrected) iusc. 22 aes paeieizeis, and paeancensto. 24 Bui. corr. altrud; in ligud the letters are defective through a blemish in the bronze, older than the inscription. The interp. is omitted in prumedicatud and manimaserum. 25 ues ex aiscen. ibid. Bü. corr. pim. 28 aes ID•NI I•SVAE. $n \cdot$ FVST $\cdot$ and at the end of the line insuaepis pr in suae. 29 Space for 10 or 11 letters is lost at the beginning, then comes a doubtful sign like $\mathbf{M}$ or $\mathbf{N}$, then a space of two or three letters followed by IFI•Q•FV with a slight mark at the foot of the first F whence Mommsen read nei for fi; the second f seems clear to me. Next, according to Avellino's article (Bull. Nap. IV. p. 28), on the fragment which he hastily copied, IS•TACUSI. This is too long, since on the other side
${ }^{30}$ ni fuid. suae pis | [contrud exeic tr pl pocapid Bansae f]ust, izic amprufid facus estud. idic medicim eizuc | . . . . . . . . $31 \ldots[. \mathrm{z} \ldots \mathrm{m}$ nerum]...... medicim acnnum VI nesimum 32 . . . . . . . . . . . . . [* ${ }^{*}$ contrud *exeic* fefacust].....aum pod 33 . . . . . . . . [*ni fuid suae op *eizois] . . . . . . . . . . medicim
there were, he said, only four letters OSQV which exactly correspond with the Latin at that point, per Jovem de[osqu]e; the Latin side however is written rather less closely than the Oscan. Av.'s ms. appears to be lost. The first letters of the rest of the line still extant on the bronze seem clearly um, and before them there seems to me the upper half of and before that is a gap of $\frac{8}{4} \mathrm{in}$. to the broken $\mathbf{u}$ of $\mathrm{q} \cdot \mathrm{fu}$, or $1 \frac{1}{8} \mathrm{in}$. to the interp. after q, i.e. room for 10 or 11 upright strokes. Combining and extending the suggestions of Lange (l.c. p. 26) and Kirchhoff (Stadtr. v. Bant. p. 29), I would restore the whole line thus; [pis censtur auti] if $q \underline{f u}$ [st, pis es] um nerwm etc., keeping Av.'s reading except in putting $\mu \mid S E$ (rubbed down say to $\mu_{1}{ }^{c} L$ ) for his $\mathrm{ACV}^{1}$. aes suaepis. The brackets in the following lines mark the text that is based on Av.'s fragment which continues; 30 ocapid bansa, 31 mz...m nerum, 32 om...udex ircfeh, 33 mluii suae... eizs. s, 34 nistreis acteis $i, 35$ est licitud tr, 36 comipid irucis, 37 tril estud, 38 timom. The restorations in the text are Jordan's (B. B. vi. 195) from 1.32 onwards. In 1.31 he suggests eizozum, a very doubtful form (there is no 'erorum' in Umbr.); after medicim, which is clear, there appears to me the top of e or a punct followed by the tip of a vertical or a, and then almost certainly cu or oi, I read acunum, cf. akenei 175 inf . 32 Before um is left the tip of a or m .33 is the last line of which any part remains on the bronze.

[^3]34. . . . . . [*mistreis *aeteis *eituas]... | . . . . . . . . . . . . .

35 . . . . . [moltaum herest licitud tr p1]... | . . . . . . . . . . . .
36 . . . . . . [* ${ }^{*}$ co hipid, *isuc is]... 1 . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .
37 . . . . . . . . . [*trid estud]
38............. . [timom].

Bücheler in Bruns' Fontes Juris Romani Antiqui (5th Ed. Freiburg in Breisgau, 1887) p. 46 gives the results of earlier writers. For the legal questions see Lange Die oslc. Inschr. d. Tab. Bant. u. die röm. Vollsgerichte, Göttingen 1853, and generally Kirchhoff Stadtrecht von Bantia, Berlin 1853, Mommsen C. 1. L. r. ${ }^{1}$ p. 46-7, Jordan B. B. vi. (1881) p. 195, Bréal Mém. Soc. Ling. Paris, Iv. (1879-1881) p. 381. On the third paragraph see Bugge Altit. Stud. p. 54, and on the fragment of Avellino (parts of 11. 29-38), Avellino Bull. Nap. Iv. (1846) p. 28, Jordan l. c.
U. D. p. 145, Zv. Osc. 142, Tab. xix., It. Inf. 231 (with de Petra's second apograph), Fabr. 2897.

## 2. The District of the Daunii.

## 29-30 Coins of Ausculum and Teate.

Ausculum.
a. $a v h v \sigma \kappa \lambda)(a v h v$

Type : greyhound on round shield )(ear of barley with leaf.
b. avhvoк $\lambda_{\iota}$

Type: Horse's head bridled )( ear of barley with leaf.
c. $\alpha v \sigma \kappa \lambda \alpha$

Type: head of young Heracles with lion's skin and club )( Nike, with wreath and palm.
d. $a \cup \sigma K \ldots$
e. $\alpha v \sigma \kappa \lambda \iota \nu$

Type: Kalydonian boar, under a spear-head )(ear of barley with leaf. $a \beta$ Tar.-Ion. ; in $(a)$ and $(b) \leqslant=\sigma, A=a$, in (c) and (e) $C$ and $A$, in $(d)$, which alone is retrograde, $\bigcirc$ and $A$. They are all bronze. ( $a$ ) and (b) are before 300 в.c. in good style; the rest in base style $300-200$ в.c.

Poole Cat. G. C. Br. Mus. I. p. 131, Head Hist. Num. p. 38, Momms. U. D. p. 201. Friedl. Osk. M. p. 54. Dressel Beschreibung d. ant. Mïnzen d. kön. Museen (Berlin 1894), III. 1. p. 183. Zvet. Osc. 182.

30 Teate (Teanum Apulum), first allied with Rome in 318 b.c. Liv. 9. 20, Momm. l. inf. c.

## a. tiiatium

Bronze coins found on the site of Teanum; type, wreathed Apollo )( Campanian bull, older than (b). Friedl. Osk. M. p. 47, Momm. U. D. p. 301 ; Beschr. ant. Münz. Berl. riI. 1. p. 204. Zvet. Osc. 163 and others have erroneously referred these to Teate Marrucinorum who would probably have been puzzled by the Osc. $a \beta$; cf. Momm. Ann. Inst. Arch. Rom. 1846 p. 118 f. $t$ is T , $\mathbf{u} Y$, as naturally before 300 в.с.

## b. tiati

Many coins of different types and sizes (for which see Head Hist. Num. p. 41, Poole Cat. G. C. Br. Mus. I. p. 145 ff.); both bronze and silver with the same inscr. in Latin (or Greek) characters. The silver has

Tarentine types (' $300-268$ B.C. or later' Head), and the bronze is of the uncial system and therefore later than 217 B.c.

Note iv. There are no other Oscan inscriptions from the Northern half of Apulia, but there is a Latin inscription (at Luceria, C. I. L. Ix. 782) which, if the text be trustworthy, shows il curious admixture of Oscan forms (first pointed out by H. Buchholz, Osk. Perfect. in Lat. Inschrift, Berlin 1878). It is now built into the foundations of $=$ house and can be seen but not read! The text is Mommsen's restoration of a copy printed from a manuscript which is now lost. The words which are wholly or partly Oscan are printed in lieavy type. If these were not correctly copied, Dame Fortune for once has proved a good scholar; the forms in -tad and -tid are perfectly possible Oscan, though they occur nowhere else. Luceria became a Latin colony in 314 b.c. (ef. C. I. L. Ix. p. 74).

In hoce loucarid stircus ne [qu]is fundatid neue cadauer prolecitad, neue parentatid. Sei quis arvorsu hac faxit, [civ]ium quis uolet proioudicatod n. [L.] manum iniect[i]o estod. Seive mag[i]steratus uolet moltare [li]cetod.

## 31-36 Local and Personal Names of Iapygra (Calabria and Apulia).

## 31 Place-names ${ }^{1}$ of Calabria ${ }^{2}$.

A. Well attested (in form, date and locality).

Īāpy̆ges ${ }^{3}$, -gĭa, -gium promontorium (=Capo di Leuca), cl. Călăber ${ }^{3}$, -bri, Calabria cl. inscc. The name Calabrie was transferred to the Bruttian promontory in the 11th cent. A.D.
Sallentini ${ }^{8}$ and Sālent- cl., Sall- C.I.L. I. ${ }^{1}$ p. 457 (Acta Triumph. Cap.).
Messāpĭíi, -ǐa cl. insc.
Leuca fem. sing. Luc. 5. 376, n. pl. Stra. 6. 3. 5. Capo di Leuca. Minervae Castra cl.
Uzentum (Ov̋ $\xi \in \nu \tau o \nu ~ P t o l.) ~ e l . ~ i n s c ., ~ n m . ~ a o \zeta ఢ, ~ o \zeta a, ~ o \zeta a v . ~ M o m m . ~ U . ~ D . ~$ p. 51, Head p. 56. Ugento.
${ }^{1}$ For the arrangement and notation see the List of Signs and Abbreviations.
${ }^{2}$ The Itinerary-tables for Calabria are given C. I. L. Ix. p. 1.
${ }^{3}$ On the ethnography of these and other names in this district see 25 A . Rem.
[Callipolis Pl., Mela. Gallipoli.]
Hydruntum, -tinus ('Y $\delta \rho o u ̂ s$, Cic. Hydrus) cl. but Kiep. Alte Geogr. p. 453 cites Hutrentum from a late insc. which I cannot identify. Otranto.

Lupiae (also Lupp-) cl., -ienses C. I. L. x. 1795. Lécce.
Rŭdĭae, -dinus cl. C. I. L. Ix. 23 ('P由ঠ- Stra.) Rágge (K.), Ruggiáno.
 also -dus-) ${ }^{1}$. Brenda Paul. Fest. p. 33 Müll. : for deriv. (Messap. brentes 'a stag's head') v. Mom. C. I. L. IX. p. 8, Kiep. Alte Geogr. p. 453. Brindisi.
Uria, oppa (nm. in Messap. aß Head p. 43) 'Ypía, Oúpia. cl., Urites Liv. 42. 48, v. Mom. C. I. L. IX. p. 20. Oria.

Manduria Liv. 27. 15 al. Manduria.
Sătŭrı̆um cl. -1̌us Verg. G. 2. 197, Sătŭrēiānus (caballus) Hor. Sat. 1. 6. 59, £ärưplò orac. ap. Strabo 6. 3. 2. Torre di Sáturo? (Dict. Anct. Geog. s. v. Tarentum).
Aulon (vallis) cl. e.g. Hor. Od. 2. 6. 18.
Tărentum, -tinus (Tápas) cl. inscc. Taranto.
Gălaesus fl. cl. S. Madonna di Galeso (K.).

## B. Less certain.

Fratuentini C. I. L. Ix. 1006 (-ertium Pl. 3. 11. 100).
Anxa the older name of Callipolis (Gallipoli) Pl. 3. 11. 100 al.
 Vereto ( $\boldsymbol{K}$.).
$\Lambda \in v \tau \in \rho \nu i a \pi a \rho a \lambda i ́ a$ between Leuca and Baris, Stra. 6. 3. 5 al.
Aletium Ptol. 3. 1. 76 ('A $\lambda_{\eta}^{\prime}$-) al, ?nm. Fa $\lambda \in \theta a s$ or $\beta a \lambda \epsilon \theta a s$ ( 300 B.O.) cited C. I. L. Ix. p. 3, Head p. 42. Alézio, S. M. della Lîzza.
Nauna, and emporium Naunitanum C. I. L. Ix. 10.
Barra (insula) Caes. B. C. 3. 23. 100 al. (= Pharos Mela 2. 7. 114).


## C. Doubtful.

${ }^{\text {}} \mathrm{H} \mu \iota \lambda a ́ \mu \iota o \nu, \mu \epsilon ́ \rho o s ~ M \epsilon \sigma \sigma a \pi i ́ \omega \nu ~ H e s y c h . ~$
Basta Pl. 3. 11. 100, ? = Bav̂бтa (alii Bav̂orpa) Ptol. 3. 1. 67; cf. Basterbini Pl. 3. 11. 105.

[^4]Valesium Pl. 3. 11. 101, -etium Mel. 2. 4. 66, -entium Tab. P.; ?cf. Aletium supr. B.
[Spēluncae N. of Brundisium Itinn.]
Stulnini Pl. 3. 11. 105, इrô̂pyoı Ptol. 3. 1, nm. $\sigma \tau v$ - Head p. 43, ?cf. territorium Austranum Lib. Col. 211.
ad Sapriportem (xv millia a Tarento) Liv. 26. 39.
Kapßìpa, -áтaı Athenae. 12. 23 ter.
Фáخaı near Tarentum, Iamblichus Vita Pythag. c. 31 § 190.
Graxa, Gra.. nm. like those of Brundisium, found on the Tarentine gulf, Head p. 43, Garrucci Mon. Ital. Antic. p. 119. ? Grassáno.
Grumbestini? Pl. 3. 11. 105 ; Garrucci, ibid. ascribes to this community coins with $\gamma \rho v$ (circa 300 b.c.) ; otherwise Head p. $39^{1}$.
Varia? Pl. 3. 11. 100, territorium V arinum Lib. Col. p. 211 Lachm. are probably only mistakes for Uria v. Mom. C. I. L. ix. p. 20.
Portus Sasina (? -ea)
Senum?
Soletum desertum
Miltopes statio
Apamestini
Argetini
Deciani Pl. 3. 11. 105.
Palionenses?
Tutini
PI. 3. 11. 100.


Austranum territorium? Lib. Colon. Lachm. p. 211, ?leg. Baustr-.

[^5]
## 32 Personal Names ${ }^{1}$ of Calabria ${ }^{2}$.

| A. Frequent. |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. Nomina. |  |  |  |
| gens Antonia | Gabinia <br> Claudia | Iulia | Pomponia |
| Gerellana | Octauia $l$. | Titinia |  |

2. Cognomen.

Rufus
B. Less frequent.

1. Nomina.

| gens Acerratia | Caluentia | Laenia | Publilia |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Aemilia | Caninia | Lollia | Rutilia (inf.) |
| Albinia | Clodia | Lucretia | Sergia |
| Allia | Cocceia | Memmia | Seruilia |
| Aquillia | Cornelia | Messia | Sextia |
| Arruntia | Domitia | Mindia | Terraea lib. |
| Auidia | Fadia | Mussiena | Tuccia |
| Aulia | Fannia | Negilia $l$. | Tutoria |
| Betiliena | Flauia | Pacilia $l$. | Valeria |
| Caesellia (inf.) | Fufia | Petronia (inf.) | Veratia |
| Caesia | Geminia | Plinial. | Vibia (inf.) |
| Calauia (inf.) | Grania | Pompeia | Vigilia |
| Calpurnia | Iunia (inf.) | Publicia | Volumnia |

2. Among the Cognomina may be mentioned Corinthus Ianuarius
${ }^{1}$ For the arrangement and notation see the List of Signs and Abbreviations.
${ }^{2}$ From C. I. L. 1x. 1-258, I. G. It. Sic. 668-684.
C. Occurring only once in the district.

| gens Acerratina | Ceruonia | Laecania | Pontia (inf.) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Acilia | Cincia | Lania | Puticia |
| Aelia | Cordia | Lateria | Retula |
| Afrania | Cortidia ${ }^{\text {d }}$. | Luceia | Rudia |
| Ammia | Cossia | Lucilia | Sabidia (inf.) |
| Aninia | Crispia | Maria | Saluia |
| \{ Ania | Curia | Mercellia | Samiaria |
| Annia (g, inf.) | Curtia | Munatia | Septumulena |
| Appuleia | Ennenia? | Nearcha | Sileia |
| Arrecina | Fabia | Nemestronia | Sillia (inf.) |
| Atoleia? | Faenia | Nouia | Spedia (inf.) |
| Audia (inf.) | Faleria | Numisia l. (inf.) | Statia (inf.) |
| Aurelia | Ficellia | Numitoria | Statilia |
| Axia | Fuluia | Oppia (inf.) | Stlaccia |
| Baebia | Gauia (inf.) | Pactumeia | Titia |
| Barria | Gerelliana | Papiria | Tituria |
| Caecilia | Gifinia | Passenia | Vehilia |
| Caecina(nom. mase.) | $\overline{\text { Graecalia }}$ | Patronia $l$. | Vettia (inf.) |
| Caerellia | Hoscinia | Peticia | Veturia |
| Camiana | Hostilia | Plotia $l$. | Visellia |
| Camurtia Cautina | Inuentia | Pollionia | Vipia |

## 1 a. To these may be added

L. Rammius Brundisinus, Liv. 42, 17 ('Eppévylos App. 9. 4).

## 2. Among the Cognomina.

| Dama | Paelina | Saturninus | Violus |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Deceberillus | Papia l. vir (inf.) | Saturnio | Vistulla |
| Fufus | Saenanius | Stilpa $(g)$ | Vrsus |
| Mercello | Samutha $(g)$ |  |  |

## 33 Place-names ${ }^{1}$ of the Peucetil ${ }^{2}$.

A. Well attested (in form, date and locality).
$\{$ Peucĕtři -ětǐa cl. also called
Poediculi cl. (пoठ- Appian B. C. 1. 52); for the area of the tribes
 v. sub Apulus 35 A , and for their (Illyrian) origin and that of many place-names in this district see 25 A sup. and the authorities there cited.
Silvium, -inus el.
Gnātǐa cl., 「vaAivov Kaibel 685. Later (Pliny, Strabo) called Egn- or Ignatia, v. C. I. L. ix. p. 28. Torre d Egnázia (Vogel), $d^{p}$ Agnázzo (K.).
Caelia Pl. 3. 11. 100 al. nm. insc. (also Kèia, v. C. I. L. rx. p. 30). Céglie Messapica.
Bārūum, -rinus cl. insce.; also in pl. abl. Baris C. I. L. VI. 2381 b 1. 10. Bäri delle Paglie.

Ăcěrontĭa Hor. Od. 3. 4. 14. al. (-untini C. I. L. IX. 417, later -entC. I. L. xi. 482). Acerénza.

Bantra,-tinus cl. inscc. cf. supr. no. 28. Pliny is the only authority who refers this to Lucania, v. Momms. C. I. L. ix. p. 43. Bánzi.
Forentum, -ntani cl. v. Momms. ibid. Forénza.
Vĕnŭsǐa, -sinus cl. insce., cf. p. 22 footn. Venósa.
Voltŭr (mons) Hor. Od. 3. 4. 9 al. M. Vulture.
Bŭtuntum, -tuntini -tuntinenses cl. (-untones Itinn.). Bitónto.
Rŭbi Hor. Sat. i. 5.94 al.,. 'Pu千, 'Pvßacteivounm. Head p. 40, Ru bustini Pl. 3. 11. 105. Rávo di Púglia.
Ausculum cl. insce. nm. (v. supr. no. 29); often written Asc- in mss. ef. Apulus 35 A. Áscoli-Satriäno.
Aufidus fi. cl. v. under 160 (Hirpini) A.
Cănŭsĭum, -sinus - $i$ írat cl. insce. Canósa di Púglia.
Cannae, -nnenses cl. Mässa di Cánne.
Vergellus fl. cl. Vergello $f$.

[^6]
## B. Less certain.

Collatini Pl. 3. 11. 105 al. =ager Carmeianus Lib. Colon. pp. 210, 261.

Genusia,-sinus Pl. 3. 11. 105 al. Genósa.
Diria, -rini Pl. 3. 11. 105, Itimn.
Bradanus fl. It. Ant. p. 104. Brádano f.
Norba Itinn. -banenses Pl. 3. 11. 105.
[Neapolis only known from coins from this district with the legend עєat C. I. L. Ix. p. 30 Head p. 40. Polignáno.]
Ămīnēa uinea C. I. L. x. 114 1. 29, -ēum uinum cl. ' $\delta i i^{\prime}$ évòs $\bar{\nu}$ ' Hesych., who makes ' $\mathrm{A} \mu \mathrm{\mu vai} a=$ Peucetia; for other views see Macrob. 3. 20 ad fin. and Jahn ad loc.
Bandusia fons, see under 310 (Sabini) B.

## C. Doubtful.

Canales It. Ant. p. 121.
Lupatia Itinn.
Blera Itinn.
Arnestum It. Ant. p. 313.
A $\zeta$ єтนขoınm. Head p. 38, Ezetium Itinn. (?=Aegetini Pl. 3. 11. 105 and Nítıov Str. 6. 3. 7.).
Opino or Ad Pinum? It. Ant. pp. 104, 113. ?Oppido (older name of Palmíra).
Furfane? Tab. P.
Natiolum? Itinn. ?Giovinázzo.
Turenum? Itinn. ?Tráni.
Barduli Itinn. ? Barlétta.
Pactius fl.? Pl. 3. 11. 102.
D. Further modern names.

Montepelöso, Bitettto, Fasáno, Matéra, Melff.

## 34 Personal Names ${ }^{1}$ of the Peucetil ${ }^{2}$.

A. Frequent.

1. Nomina.

| gens Abuccia | Claudia | Herennia (inf.) | Pompeia |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Aelia | Clodia | Iulia | Publicia |
| Annia (inf.) | Cornelia | Iunia (inf.) | Salvia (inf.) |
| Antonia, | Dasimia | Licinia | Sempronia |
| Auillia | Egnatia (inf.) | Liuia | Titia (inf.) |
| Aurelia | Ennia | Lucilia | Valeria lib. (inf.) |
| Baebia | Fabia | Marcia (inf.) | Vauidia lib. |
| Caecilia | Flauia | Maria (inf.) | Vettia (inf.) |
| Canuleia | Gauia (inf.) | Petronia (inf.) |  |

2. Among the Cognomina may be mentioned
Ianuarius Rufus
${ }^{1}$ For the arrangement and notation see the list of Signs and Abbreviations.
${ }^{2}$ From C. I. L. Ix. 259-685, 6172-6241, 6403-6, etc., I. G. It. Sic. 685-8.
B. Less frequent.
3. Nomina.

| gens Acilia | Cassia | Lucullena? | Sedeciana |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Aemilia | Clatia | Lysia | Seia (inf.) |
| Alfia (inf.) | Cominia (inf.) | Martia | Seruia |
| Aninia | Creperia (inf.) | Metilia (inf.) | Sextilia lib. |
| Antistia | Critonia lib. | Minatia,(Men-)(inf.) | Silia (inf.) |
| Appalena | Curia | Minucia lib. | Sotidia |
| Appia | Curtia lib. | Mucia | Staëdia (inf.) |
| Appuleia | Decimia lib. | Munatia | Statia (inf.) |
| Apronia | Domitia | Muttiena | Sulpicia |
| Aquillia | Drussia | Nonia (inf.) | Tarutia lib. |
| (Arreniana) | Esquilia | Numisia (inf.) | Titinia |
| Arria | Fadia | Nummia | Trebellia |
| Artoria | Faenia | Oppia (inf.) | Triccia |
| Ata? lib. | Faleria | Ouia lib. (inf.) | (Tulliana) |
| Athania | Ferrena | Papiria | Tutoria lib. |
| Atilia | Flaminia | Plestina | Velasia? |
| Attia | Fuluia | Pontia (inf.) | Vellaea lib. |
| Anittia | Geminia | Pomponia | Veratia |
| Baberia (inf.) | Graecidia | Rabiria | Verronia |
| Betitia (inf.) | Heluia (inf.) | Raenidia lib. | Vibia (inf.) |
| Bruttia, Bri- ( $g, l$ ) | Lepidia | Roscia | Vinnia |
| Burbatia | Libuscidia | Satria (inf.) | Vlpia |
| Busidia | Lucilia | Scalacia | Voconia |
| Caetronia | Lucretia | Scutaria | Volusia |
| Caluia (inf.) |  |  |  |

## 2. Among the Cognomina.

| Dumnana | Marullus | Rufillus | Salassus |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Marullina $l$. | Polla | Rufinus | Saturninus |

C. Occurring only once in the district.

1. Nomina.

| gens Accia (inf.) | Cleppia (inf.) | Mamilia | Rutilia |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Acuuia | Clonidia | Mettia (inf.) | Sabellia lib. |
| Aedinia | Cocia lib. | Mitullcia? | Saenia |
| Albia (inf.) | Coelia | Murdia lib. | Salisia |
| Alfidia | Cuspia ? | Murrasia lib. | Satrena |
| Anicia $l i b$. | Decia | Mutronia | Saufeia |
| Apertia | Dellia | Naria | Sauonia |
| Articuleia | Didia | Neria | Scribonia |
| Aufidiz | Ducea? | Nouia | Sentia |
| Auidiacca lib. | Eggia | Numeria | Sepunia |
| Autronia | Eppia | Numpidia | Sextia |
| Babullia | Fonteia | Octauia (inf.) | Sibilisia |
| Badia | Fufidia | Ofilia (inf.) | Sogellia |
| Balonia | Fullonia (inf.) | Ossidia lib. | Sosia |
| Barbatia lib. | Fundania | Pacilia (inf.) | Stallia |
| Battia? | Gellia | Pacuuia (inf.) | Statilia lib. |
| Bimia? | Gerellana | Peducea | Tagullia lib. |
| Biuellia (inf.) | Glitia | Perpernia | Tannonia? |
| Blassidia | Grittia | Pescennia | Tedia |
| Caelia | Heia (inf.?) | Peticia | Terentia (inf.) |
| Caelidia | Herminia | Petilia | Timinia |
| Caelonia? | Horatia | Petinia | Tintiria (inf.) |
| Caesellia (inf.) | Hostilia | Pisentia | Turellia lib. |
| Callonia | Ignatia | Pontiena | Turpilia |
| Camillia | Lania | Postumia lib. | Veidia |
| Campila lib. | Larcia | Postumulena | Venellia |
| Caninia | Lautinia? lib. | Publilia | Vibiena |
| Carinatia | Ligeria | Pulfennia | Vinucia (inf.) |
| Cascia | Lorenia | Rauelia? | Virginia |
| Catinia | Lucania | Rossia | Viselia |
| Ceciena | Maecia (inf.) | Rufrena | Volcacia |
| Ceia | Mallia | Rumeia | Vssaea |
| Ceternia | Mamercia (inf.) |  |  |
|  | 2. Among the | Cognomina. |  |
| Alticus | Dasm[us] | Marus | Silo (inf.) |
| Aprilis | Eleuther | Sagaxis (g) | Vrsus |
| Brocchus |  |  |  |

## 35 Place-names of Daunia.

## A. Well attested.

Dauni ${ }^{1}$ and -nii, -nia cl.
Aecae cl. inscć.
Herdōnia and -nea cl., -doniae, C. I. L. rx. 1156, op $\alpha a \nu \omega \nu$ nm. Head, p. 39, Ardaneae Liv. 24. 20; -onienses Plin. -onitanus? C. I. L. IX. 670. Ordona.

Sălăpĭa, -pinus, also Salp- cl., $\sigma a \lambda a \pi-\sigma a \lambda \pi-$ nm. Head, p. 41. Lago di Salpi.
Lūcĕrǐa, -erinus el. inscc. -карía Polyb. Lucera.
Arpi -pani -pini cl.; also 'A prvpím $\pi a$ Argy̆rĭpa (fem. sing.), e.g. Verg. Aen. 11. 246 ; cf. Arpinum 256 A inf. Arpe (Kiep.).
 (Kiep.).
Gargānus (mons) cl. M. Gargáno.
Mătīnus (mons) cl. ? cf. Mattinúta.
 cf. Uria in Calabria ( 31 A ).
Tēānum Apulum, -anenses cl. inscc.; older Tĕāte, -ātes, cf. no. 30 supr. and Mom. C. I. L. Ix. p. 67.
Āpŭlus, Āpūlia (mss. often Appu-, inscc. always Apu-) el. insec. ( $\AA$ p- only in Hor. Od. 3. 24. 4 mare Apulicum? and 3. 4. 10 nutricis limina Apuliae?) The name properly belonged to a Samnite ${ }^{2}$ stock living round Mt. Garganus (Stra. 6. 3. 11). Paglia in e.g. Rávo di $P$.
For Larinum see under 197 (Frentani) A.

## B. Less certain.

Vibinum, -nates Pl. 3. 11. 105 al. Oủßßápra? Ptol. 3. 1. 63. Bovíno, mediaer. Bibina (Dict. Corog.).
Cerbalus Pl. 3. 11. 103. Cerváro.
Atrani Pl. 3. 11. 105. Atre It. Rav. 4. 31.

[^7]Geronium（－reonium bis in mss．Liv．）cl．（ $\Gamma \in \rho \circ \dot{\nu} \nu o \nu, \Gamma \epsilon \rho \omega v i a, ~ \Gamma \epsilon-$ р $\eta$ vía．）
Merinates（ex Gargano）Pl．3．11．105．Torre di Meríno（Kiep．）．
Kєpauvı入ía Diod．Sic．20．26．Cerignóla．
C．Doubtful．
Respa It．Ant．p． 313.
Aufidena It．Ant．p． 313.
Salinae Itinn．
Sentianum and Velinianum It．Ant．p． 112 v．Mom．C．I．L．Ix． p． 657.
Acuca Liv．24． 20.
Aquilonis mutatio It．Hier．p．609．？Celóne $f$ ．
Ănīmŭla？best Mss．of Paul．Fest．Müll．25，and restored text Plaut． Mil．3．1．53．In both places Büch．（Fleckeisen＇s Jakrb．1863，p．774）， and others would read Aminula．
Anxanum Itinn．
Ergitium Tab．P．Egr－An．Rav．（bis）．
Tatinie An．Rav．4． 31.
Apenestae Ptol．3．1． 14.
Fertor fl．（alii Frento）Pl．3．11．103．Fortore $f$ ．
Aegasus portus
Garnae portus Pl．3．11． 102.
Lacus Pantanus
Monades Pl．3．11． 104.
Dardi Pl．3．11． 104.
Mateolani Pl．3．11．105，Mat．nm．Head p．40．？Matéra sup． 33 D．
$\Sigma \iota \delta \iota \nu \circ \iota$ ？ nm ．（ $-\omega \nu$ ）with type like those of Mateola，in Ion．$a \beta$ ，Poole， Cat．Gr．Coins Br．Mus．I．p． 395.
Cliternia Pl．3．11． 103 （cf．under 275 （Aequicoli）A）．
$\Delta \rho i ́ o \nu \lambda o ́ \phi o s ~ \tau \eta ̂ s ~ \Delta a v y i ́ a s ~ S t r a . ~ 6 . ~ 3 . ~ 9 ~ b u t ~ g e n . ~ \Delta \rho i o v o s ~ S c y l a x ~ 15 . ~$
Пoठàєєрiov ท̀ $\rho \hat{\varphi} o \nu$ Stra．6．3． 9.
‘Iepòs 入ó申os？Tá入ıov？and
Kатара́кта？Diod．Sic．20． 26.
Apĭnae et Trīcae（Martial 14．1）were once cities in Apulia according to Pliny 3 § 104 ，but the use of the plural in the proverb and of tricue independently makes it doubtful whether the places ever existed except in a gramrnarian＇s cobweb．Ribbeck，Leipziger Studien IX．p．337， derives the words from áфávat＇Cloud－cuckoo－borough＇and трíxes；on the phonetic change in the last see Lindsay，Lat．Lang．p． 58.
D. Further modern names.
S. Martino in Pensilis, Perazzo, Ripabottóni, Cĥ̂euti, Lesina, Varáno, Triffône (Kiep.), Iélsi, Bíccari, Fóggia, Ortanôva, Fảeto, Biscéglie, Molfétta, Coráto, Rionéro in Vúlture, Atella.

## 36 Personal Names ${ }^{1}$ of the Daunir.

A. Frequent.

1. Nomina.
gens Aurelia
Baebia
Calpurnia
2. None of the frequent Cognomina call for notice.
B. Less frequent.
3. Nomina.

| gens Aemilia | Herennia (inf.) | Nonia (inf.) | Statia (inf.) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ammia | Hezzia? | Ocratia | Sulpicia |
| Anicia | Iulia | Octauia lib. (inf.) | Talania |
| Arria | Iunia (inf.) | Oppia (inf.) | Teia (inf.) |
| (Caesoniana) | Luccia | Petronia (inf.) | Terentia (inf.) |
| Claudia | Lutatia | Pilia lib. | Tiberia |
| Egnatia (inf.) | Magia | Pontia (inf.) | Valeria (inf.) |
| Erucia | Maria (inf.) | Saenia lib. | Vergilia |
| Fabia | Media (Mae-) lib. | Satria lib. (inf.) | Vibiena |
| Flauia | Minatia (inf.) | Sestia lib. | Vitoria |
| Gauia (inf.) | Muttiena | Sextia | Vlpia |
| Heluia (inf.) | Naeuia (inf.) | Staia (inf.) |  |

2. Among the Cognomina.

Bassus Ianuarius Rufus

[^8]${ }^{2}$ From C. I. L. 1x. 686-723, 782-967, 6242, 6252-4, etc.
C. Occurring only once in the district.

| 1. Nomina. |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| gens Accia (inf.) | Capria lib. | Messia ? | Rufria (inf.) |
| Acestia | Caspilana | Mettiena | Sattia |
| Achillenia | Catilia | Minucia | Sertia |
| (Acutiana) | Cerrinia | Mummia | Seruia lib. |
| Aelia | Clusenia | Neria | Sescenia lib. |
| Albicia | Cronia | Nouia | Sorgia lib. |
| Alfia (inf.) | Curiatia | Numisia (inf.) | Statoria |
| Allia (inf.) | Dastidia | Nummia | Stenia (inf.) |
| Angilia? | Didiolena | Obinia? | Stlar...? |
| Annia (inf.) | Domitia | Paccia (inf.) | Tamullia |
| Artoria | Ennia | Paculeia (inf.) | Tettia (inf.) |
| Aruentia lib. | Fiscenia? (inf.) | Pasidia | (Tisiana) |
| Asuiuia lib. | Galuia | Pettia (inf.) | Titia lib. (inf.) |
| Atilia | Genucia lib. | Plautia lib. | Trebia (inf.) |
| Aucidia | Grania | Polit...? | Tremelia lib. |
| Auidia | Ipta? | Pomponia | Vecillia |
| Babbia lib. (inf.) | Licinia | Raecia | Veratia |
| Boatia lib. | Lucceia lib. | Rubria | Vibbina? |
| Busia | Lucerinia | Rufinia | Villia |
| Caesia | Lusia (inf.) | Rufrania | Vmettia |
| Canuleia lib. | Maia lib. (inf.) |  |  |

2. Among the Cognomina.

| Alenus | Aprylla | Corinthus | Sabulus |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Apra | Camene | Pollio | Saturnina |
| Aprio |  |  |  |

## 37 Glosses from Southern Italy.

(From Hesychius ${ }^{1}$, except where other reference is given.)
A. Certainly Ascan, as being assigned to S. Italy or Sicily and either (a) showing distinctively Oscan phonetic characteristics, or $(\beta)$ closely resembling Oscan words, or $(\gamma)$ being parallel to Latin words without distinctively Latin characteristics.

## a. With Oscan characteristics.

1. With variation between breathed and voiced explosives ${ }^{2}$.
 Pollux 10.§ 107 [Immisch l.c. p. 315] who adds $\pi a \tau a ́ \lambda \lambda \iota a$, $\pi a \tau \in ́ \lambda \lambda \iota o \nu$ (6. § 90) the latter clearly from Lat. (or Ital.) patella.








Immisch (l.c: p. 311) compares from Gloss. Gr.-Lat. and Lat.-Gr. (Goetz
 Boúrtis, cupa. Bov́rtıov, cupella. Further Fr. botte, boute.
${ }^{1}$ Immisch, Leipziger Studien 8 p. 267 ff . gives an interesting, and, I suppose, an exhaustive account of the channels through which words of Italic origin found their way into Greek books. The chief intermediaries were the Sicilian writers of comedy, Epicharmus (c. 480 в.c.), Sophron (c. 400 в.c.), Rhinthon (c. 300 в.c.) and Blaesus of Capreae ( $300-200$ в.c.), all of whom Hesychius constantly cites. These are important for our purpose because at the dates of all but the last of them Oscan was probably the only Italian dialect with which the Greeks of Sicily would come frequently into contact. For details as to other and later Greek writers who use or cite words of Italian origin, and for the growth of the gloss material down to the times of Hesychius, the reader must be referred to Immisch's careful monograph.

I should perhaps explain that I compiled a list of forms from Hesych. before I discovered Immisch's article; hence I have only mentioned his name where he gives forms which I had overlooked, or where I have copied some note of his.
${ }^{2}$ Bugge Kuhn's Zeitschr. 22. 385, Conway Am. Journ. Phil. 11. 307 ff.; the theory is on the whole rejected by von Planta Osk.-Umb. Gr. p. 559 ff . See $\equiv$ rejoinder in Class. Rev. 1893 p. 467 f. Compare also p. 227 inf . Note xxiv.

## 2. With anaptyctic vowel.



3. Otherwise marked.
$\int a ́ \rho \beta i ́ \nu \nu \eta{ }^{\prime}$ крє́as, $\Sigma \iota \kappa \in \lambda о i ́$.
$\left\{\begin{array}{l}\text { arbilla, aruina, id est pinguedo corporis Fest. } 20 \mathrm{M} \text {. (Immisch l.c. } \\ \text { p. 322.) }\end{array}\right.$ p. 322.)

It is tempting to recognise in this form Osc. $b=$ Lat. $v=$ I.-Eu. $g$, especially if $-\nu \nu$-be correct rather than $-l l$-. The word aruina (Verg. Aen. 7.627) seems pure Latin; cf. A. Cornelius Cossus Aruina Liv. 8. 38. 1.

## B. Resembling Oscan words.

 $\chi$ Хо $\delta \dot{\eta}$ é $\phi \theta \dot{\eta}$.
Immisch l.c. p. 314 justly compares Oscan uruvi 'curva' and Lat. urvare ' circumdare' (Enn.).

## \%. Parallel to Latin words, but not distinctively Latin.

$\beta$ иú $\beta \in \lambda a$. крéa ßoєía. Immisch p. 323 justly compares Lat. bubula. $\mu$ оíтоу 'mutuum, a loan.'

Varro L. L. 5. 179 Si datum quod reddatur, mutuum, quod Siculi $\mu$ oítov, itaque scribit Sophro $\mu$ oirov...-the following word being corrupt, as is the Hesychian gloss on $\mu$ orvol except that the word is explicitly quoted from a proverb of the $\Sigma_{l \kappa \in \lambda}{ }^{\prime}($ (ingeniously restored by Immisch l.c. p. 318).
$\pi а ́ \mu \pi а \nu о \nu \cdot$ ท̀ $\Delta \eta \mu \eta \tau_{\eta \rho}$ ẻv 'Hраклєía. Immisch p. 327 compares Lat. pampinus.

 xáp $\mu$ оv Bovoi $\rho \iota \delta \iota$, and from Tab. Heracl. (Kaibel, Inscc. Gr. It. et Sic. 645) I. 1. 102 ảmágovtı és ròv סамóvıov joүóv. Jordan Krit. Beitr. p. 84 identified the word with Lat. rogus, assuming that the pyre was so named by the Romans from its likeness to a barn.
To these Tmmisch (p. 295) would add $\sigma a ́ \nu \nu o \rho o s, \mu \omega \rho o ̀ s ~ \pi a \rho a ̀ ~ ' P i \nu \theta \omega \nu t$,


 even less obvious.

Remark 1. The (originally) Sicilian form $\lambda$ itpa compared with Lat. libra clearly points to an early Italic *lithra. On the meaning of the word see Hultsch Gr.-Rom. Metrol. ${ }^{2}$ p. 290.

Pemark 2. Ancient grammarians, as Steph. Byz. s.v. 'A $\mu \beta$ pakia -кîvos, described all ethnica ending in -ivos as belonging to the rúros 'I $\tau a \lambda \iota \kappa o ́ s$, and they are certainly very frequent in Magna Graecia (e.g. $\Lambda$ eovtîvos, 'P $\eta \hat{i} \hat{\nu} o s$, Tapavtîvos) at dates long before any Latin influence is to be thought of. The termination does occur elsewhere on Greek soil, e.g. 'A $\mu$ opyivos, yet it is possible that Ahrens Gr. Dial. ir. p. 390 and Immisch l.c. p. 271 may be right in ascribing its prevalence in Magna Graecia to the influence of its almost universal use by the


- $\boldsymbol{\eta} \sigma$ cos $=$ Lat. -ensis (e.g. Пото入 $\dot{\sigma} \sigma 0$ = ${ }^{*}$ Puteolenses) so far as I know does not appear in any genuine Greek names.
 $\frac{3}{12}, \frac{4}{12}, \frac{6}{12}$ of a $\lambda i \tau \rho a$ (Hultsch Metrol. ${ }^{2}$ p. 290) all in Hesychius, Immisch l.c. p. 317 plausibly regards as containing the termination of the Lat. triens, quadrans etc. (whatever that may come from; it cannot, of course, be the Lat. word as as Imm. supposed).
B. Glosses unassigned but showing Oscan phonetic characteristics.


## 1. With variation between breathed and voiced explosives.

(See p. 45 footn. 2.)
 add
$\beta \lambda \epsilon \nu \nu o ́ \nu \cdot \nu \omega \theta \hat{\eta}, \mu \omega \rho o ́ \nu$, and $\pi \lambda \epsilon \in \nu \nu a \iota \cdot \mu \nu \dot{\xi} a \iota$.
blennos stultos esse Plautus (Bacch. 1088) indicat qui ait: Stulti, stolidi,
fatui, fungi, bardi, blenni, buccones. Paul. ex F. 35 M.


## ? 2. With anaptyctic vowel ${ }^{1}$.


$\left\{\kappa \alpha ́ \rho a \nu \nu o \varsigma^{\circ} \zeta \eta \mu i a\right.$ (also with quite other significations).



## 3. With e for そ.

$\sigma \epsilon ́ \lambda \pi o \nu^{*} \sigma i \lambda \phi \iota \nu$.
${ }_{1}$ But $\phi \in \rho \in \nu a \cdot \phi \xi_{\rho \nu a}$ is given as Aeolic by Herodian and the others may be so too.
4. Otherwise marked?

Ta $\rho \pi$ ívlos 'Tarquinius' in the paraphrase in Cod. Coisl. (Par. 345) and repeatedly in that in Cod. Vat. 1307 and several mss of Tzetza ad Lycophr. 1446, though some give Тарки́v-; in the same note the name of the third king in the unorthodox list is given by the paraphr. in Cod. Vat. 1307 as "O $\sigma$ rivos" $A \gamma \gamma$ us, others "A $u$ us and (?) "A $\mu \pi v s$. The latter may conceivably be an Oscan or Volscian form as Taptivoos seems to be, but? cf. Mons Tarpeius which can hardly be anything but Latin.
C. Glosses unassigned but showing close resemblance to Oscan or Latin and possibly Oscan words.
aik $\lambda o \iota^{\circ}$ ai y $\omega \nu$ iau tov̂ $\beta \dot{\epsilon}$ lovs. ? Cf. Aeclanum.
àкирі́s $\lambda$ úx $\quad$ оs. ? Cf. Aciris fl.
"' $\xi \circ \mu \pi \lambda o \nu^{*}$ l'oo Low Lat. for exemplum, as solomni, antomnarum, (Schuchardt 2, p. 250, cf. 3, p. 279. (Immisch p. 361.)

 $\Xi\left(\begin{array}{ll}(\nu \nu \eta\end{array}\right)$, the former probably, the latter possibly=Osc. Herentas.
Immisch p. 326 suggests that the Hesychian form owes its a to such Greek

[ita ${ }^{\prime}{ }^{\circ} \varsigma^{\circ}$ rav̂pos, from Timaeus fr. 12 M. (cf. Paul. ex F. 106 M.) appears to be a Graecized form of an Italic *vitlo- Lat. vitulus. On the derivation of Graeco-Latin Italia, Osc. vitellioi see the authorities quoted s.vv Italia, Oenotria on p. 5.]

( $\nu \alpha \alpha^{\prime} \rho \omega^{*} \sigma v \nu i \eta \mu \iota$ (codd. $\nu a ́ \rho a$, corr. Lobeck, litterarum ductui obsequens).

 gnaritum, gnaruris.
тол $\lambda a \chi \rho o \nu^{\prime}$ кало́v is conceivably a Grecized Osc. form of Lat. pulcher (pure Oscan *priluidchr- ? ?). M. Schmidt would corr. áma入óxpoov.


Immisch p. 328 compares Osc. teremn-íss etc.; if so, Hesych. should have written $\tau \epsilon \rho \epsilon \mu$ - (perhaps * $\tau \epsilon \rho \epsilon \mu \eta \nu$ ?).
D. Glosses possibly Oscan as being either assigned to S. Italy and not clearly Greel in form ${ }^{1}$, or assigned to Italy generally and not clearly Latin.

ảßás' iєpà עócos парà Tapaytivo七s.




Immisch l.c. p. 272 vouches for a form á $\sigma \tau \alpha{ }^{\prime} \nu \eta \eta \mathrm{s}$ in a ms. of Zonaras at Dresden : if this is not a mere corruption, the - $\nu \nu$-marks either the later Oscan, or the true Oscan as compared with an originally Greek (or Messapian?) form.
 Tapavt.

Immisch l.c. 309 compares Umb. bananica ( 368 inf.), Ose. Bansa- and Hesych. $\beta$ avoús ( $\beta a \nu \nu-$ ) • öp $\sigma \tau \rho o \gamma \gamma \dot{\lambda} \lambda a$.

[ $\beta \rho a \sigma[\sigma i] \kappa \eta^{\cdot}{ }^{\kappa}{ }^{\prime} \alpha{ }^{\prime} \mu \beta \eta$, 'I $\tau a \lambda \iota \omega ิ \tau \alpha$, , probably pure Latin.]


damíum 'sacrificium in operto Bonae Deae, minime publicum.' Damia 'Bona Dea,' damiatrix 'sacerdos eius,' Paul. Fest. 68 Müll., and so Placid. p. 30 Deuerl.
 סápetal. $\delta a \delta o v \chi i a \ell$, with M. Schmidt ad loc. conjecturing that the priests performed a 'hunt for Persephone' with torches) Hesych.
 seem corrupt.

 origin (Lycophron 1133), and is explained also by Pollux and Eustathius ${ }^{2}$.]

[^9] mann Kuhn＇s Zeitschr．16． 106 compared Gr．єủk $\epsilon \bar{\eta} s$ ，though he could quote no example of any Greek use of this word as a divine appellative． I prefer therefore to connect it with Eűko入os．


ó á $^{\chi}$ a．катати́y $\omega$ ，Тараขт．

$\tau \in \lambda \lambda i \eta \nu^{*}$ ó $\delta \epsilon i \nu a$, Tapavt．（＇ordo re入ín requirit＇）．
$\Phi a \hat{v} \nu o s^{\prime}$＇Ita入ıkòs $\theta$ єós（with which фav̂vos＇фaivov av́róv has probably no connexion）．

E．Glosses assigned to the Tvค’pp $\begin{gathered}\text { voi } \\ \text { by Hesychius which are }\end{gathered}$ not Latin ${ }^{1}$ ，but may conceivably be Italic．





ßúppos＇ráv $\theta$ apos，Tv ${ }^{\prime} \rho{ }^{\circ}$ ．

$\delta a ́ \mu \nu o \varsigma^{\cdot i} \pi \pi \pi o s, T \nu \rho \rho \rho$ ．（extra litterarum ordinem）．

${ }^{1}$ Pure Latin words assigned by him to the same people are $\delta \in \epsilon^{*} \theta \epsilon \in \dot{d}$ and $\kappa \alpha \pi \rho \rho \cdot$ ． ${ }^{\text {aitg．This broad use of the name dates from Greek writers of the 4th（and }}$ indeed 5th）century B．c．，of．p． 52 footn．

## II. CENTRAL OSCAN.

## A. Campania.

## 1. The towns of the Sarnus valley.

A century after the Samnite invasion of Campania ${ }^{1}$, that is, at the end of the IV century B.C., we find the towns of Surrentum, Pompeii, Stabiae and Herculaneum in alliance with Nuceria, which was the chief town of the group. This is shown ${ }^{2}$ by the absence of coins from all but Nuceria, by the enrolment of all four towns (and only these in Campania) in the Tribus Menenia in 89 b.c., by the enumeration of Polybius (3. 91), and by many other details in the history of the towns. The league joined in the great Sarnnite war but submitted to Rome on favourable terms in 307 B.c. (Liv. 9. 38-41). It was broken up in 89 b.c. when the four surviving towns were attached to Rome by separate treaties, Nuceria receiving the territory of the destroyed Stabiae (Ager Nucerinus in Pliny's catalogue 3 § 62).

The chief magistrates of the league were probably, as in other Oscan confederations (e.g. 170 inf .), a meddix tuticus ( $44-5 \mathrm{inf}$.) and a kvaisstur ( 52 inf.), whom Beloch would distinguish (Camp. p. 243) from the officials of similar titles in the separate towns (meddix and kvaisstur puimpaiians 39 and 42 ), and from the aediles $(39,53)$ whose office was probably always urban. Beloch's distinction however is not quite clear at Capua: see p. 108 inf. and 117.

For the special history of Nuceria see Beloch Camp. ${ }^{2}$ p. 242 and 449, or C. I. L. x. p. 124. Of the comparatively few Latin insce. from the town itself none can be older than Sulla, and probably none are older than Augustus, so that it seems likely that Oscan was spoken there till well on

[^10]into the lasit century b.c. ${ }^{1}$ But the only Oscan inscc. we have are the legends of the coins of the league ( 144 inf .) which belong to a far earlier date.

## Surrentum.

Tradition refers Surrentum to Greek founders (e.g. Verg. Aen. 7. 738, Diod. Sic. 厄. 7) and through all its history it was strongly under Greek influence; the chief temples of the promontory belonged to Greek deities, the Sirens and Athene, and we find the neighbourhood full of Greeks down to late times (e.g. Statius Silv. 2. 2. 5). It was occupied by the Samnites, some time in the fifth or fourth century B.C., and, as we have seen, allied to Nuceria. There is no direct evidence of an Etruscan settlement, unless either of the inscc. below ( 38 and
 applied to Surrentum by Steph. Byz. vouches for nothing in view of the well-known use of the name Tv $\rho_{\rho} \eta \nu i a$ in Greek ${ }^{2}$ (starting from the 5th century B.c. ${ }^{3}$ ) to describe the W. coast of Italy generally. But on general grounds the theory of some infusion of Etruscans cannot be called improbable since there was undoubtedly a considerable Etruscan vase-factory no further North than Suessula as late as 300 b.c. (p. 94 inf.), and on the South side of their promontory the ager Picentinus fuit Tuscorum according to Plin. 3 § 64 .

Surrentum was a municipium (not a colony) down to late times, and of its Latin insce. few if any are older than the Augustan period.

[^11]38 Found in Vico Equense near Sorrento in 1877, now in the Naples Museum, where I saw it in 1894; phot. facsim. in Zvet. Osc. tab. xviii. 1.

## papes avfi

On the right-hand ear of an amphora: Osc. $a \beta$, though with $\exists=v$; the letters about 1 in . ( 024 m .) high, roughly stamped; no interpunct, but just possibly a slight gap was intended after pape. The $\mathbf{i}$ does not reach down so far as the other letters and there is a faint diagonal stroke above it (1) which may be meant for another i ; Pauli (Neue philol. Rundschau 1887 p. 123) would read pape saufii, or -fie. Zvet. Osc.133.

Note $\mathrm{\nabla}$. I cannot be sure of the Oscan character of an insc. found in Sorrento in 1813, now in the Naples Museum, where I saw it in 1894; phot. facsim. Zvet. Osc. tab. xviii. 2.

## Fıрıขєıs or Vipineis?

On a tufa stone 13 by 16 in . ( $\cdot 32$ by $\cdot 4 \mathrm{~m}$.), the letters 3 in . ( $\cdot 08 \mathrm{~m}$.) high, 1. to r. There are very few tombstones with Osc. inscc. and they are only found in districts where Gr. influence was strong ( $89-90 \mathrm{inf} .{ }^{1}$ ), which here would appear also in the use of one name only, in the $\alpha \beta$ (Tar.-Ionic with $\mathrm{P}=r, \mathrm{~N}=n, \zeta=s, \mathrm{~F}=v$ ), and in its direction from left to right. Zvetaieff and de Petra think the second letter is the Oscan $\mathbf{i}$, and there is certainly a short thorn with broken edges, which Momms. (U. D. p. 190) and the earlier editors regarded as accidental. It is unlikely that this sign, which belongs to the later Osc. a $\beta$, should appear among Gr. letters, especially in an insc. in which the Gr. order is retained, although the coins of Hyria show a confusion even more remarkable, v. inf. 142. And if i were used in the first syllable, it ought to have appeared also in the last; -eis is the regular orthography in the genitive. Pauli (l.c. sup.) would read vipineis and count the insc. one of the Campano-Etruscan group (see p. 94 ff .); I know of no others of that class written from left to right, though there are several Oscan inscc. (e.g. 1, 5, 13 sup.) so written.

Mommsen l.c., Zvet. Osc. 134, Fabr. 2827.

[^12]
## Pompeii.

Strabo tells us (5.4.8) that the inhabitants of Pompeii were successively Oscans, Etruscans with Pelasgians, and Samnites, the last being finally 'expelled' by the Romans. It lay close to the Sarnus, about a mile from the coast of the Bay of Naples, and served as an emporium for Nuceria, Nola and Acerra. It is first mentioned in history in 309 b.c. (Liv. 9. 38), when it was attacked, as a member of the Nucerine league ( p .51 ), by a Roman fleet. It remained faithful to the Roman alliance from 307 till 90 B.C., when it joined in the Italian revolt, but was taken by Sulla (App. B. C. 1. 3. 9, Vell. 2. 16), and subsequently received a colony of his veterans, led by his nephew Publius Sulla, and possessing the full Roman franchise. The original inhabitants were now in an inferior position, and continually at feud with the intruders (Cic. Sull. c. 21). All official inscc. are henceforward written in Latin. It is possible ${ }^{1}$ that the true Pompeians dwelt for a time outside the walls in a pagus whose site we do not know, but which afterwards belonged to an Augustal guild of freedmen (pagus Augustus felix suburbanus). If so, it is clear from the Latin inscc. that they had no separate municipality, but they may conceivably have had a special religious organisation ultimately replaced by that of the guild; the latter was founded in A.D. 3 (C. I. L. x. 824), a time when we may suppose that the irksome political barrier between the old and new inhabitants had been removed. With Herculaneum the town suffered severely from the earthquake of Feb. 5, 63 A.d. (cf. e.g. Sen. N. Q. 6. 1, Tac. Ann. 15. 22) and was finally overwhelmed by the great eruption of Vesuvius Aug. 24-5, 79 A.D. (cf. e.g. Plin. Ep. 6. 16. 20).

The oldest of the Latin inscc. of Pompeii are C. I. L. x. 794 (quoted 44 inf .), the record of the building of colonnades in the Forum by the 'quaestor' V. Popidius, and two or three election

[^13]placards (C. I. L. Iv. 29, 30, 36) of one Q. Caecilius, a candidate for the same office. It cannot be an accident that the $a \beta$ of these inscc. belongs distinctly to Sullan or pre-Sullan times, while no such officer as a quaestor appears in any later documents (e.g. in C. I. L. x. 844, an insc. 'Ciceronianae aetatis,' it is the duoviri who carry out the resolution of the decuriones for building the small theatre), but does appear in the Oscan inscc. ( $v$. inf.). Hence it has been inferred that these oldest Latin inscc. are also older than Sulla's colony; if so, Latin must have been in use, and in fairly common use (if the programmata were to be of any service) in Pompeii at that date. On the other hand the good condition of the painted Oscan inscc. ( $60-76$, no doubt the latest group) at the times when they were first uncovered ( 1797 onwards) and their subsequent decay (cf. the notes to 60 ff .) appear to $\mathrm{me}^{1}$ to make it improbable that they are older, at the earliest, than the Christian era. The two languages undoubtedly existed side by side during the last century b.c., Latin being alone recognised officially and in society, while Oscan was preserved mainly by intercourse with the country folk who frequented the market. Thus beside many Latin programmata later than those just mentioned, we have similar inscc. in Oscan, addressed to Oscan speaking voters (64, 67 and Note vii, p. 75), where IIIIner. obviously relates to the quattuorvirate (i.e. the two duovirs ${ }^{2}$ and the two aediles), a title characteristic of the Sullan and Triumviral colonies ${ }^{3}$.

The quaestor of the Latin inscc. referred to above has been also regarded (see Mommsen C.I.L. x. p. 93) as an officer of the more or less hypothetical pagus of the expelled Pompeians. This seems to me very unlikely from both the character and language of the inscc. themselves ; an officer of the unhappy exiles would not build porches in the Forum, much less would he appeal to his constituents in Latin. But another alternative to accepting these inscc. as older than the Sullan colony may perhaps be suggested. May not the veterans have taken over the old municipal constitution as they found it for the first year or two, and only subsequently abolished the quaestorship? That that office could exist in a colony beside that of the

[^14]IIviri is shown by many inscc., e.g. from Abella, Aeclanum and Vibo ${ }^{1}$. On the other hand, the old Pompeian family of the Popidii must have made friends with the conquerors very quickly, if one of them was put in charge of the town revenues within a year or two of the conquest.

The Oscan inscc. which are older than Sulla (39-59) may be roughly put into three chronological groups, according to the degree of finish with which they are written, and the forms of $f$ and $d$, whose loops are open in earlier and closed in later inscc. ${ }^{2}$
(1) 42 and 50 have their strokes thickened at the ends ('finials') like the Terminus Abellanus, show 8 and $A$, and generally are cut in handsome style. They may be safely assigned to the Gracchan period.
(2) a. $40,46,48$ and 50 have no finials but show 8 and 9.
b. $43,44,45$ and 53 have no finials, and show 8 beside Я, occasionally $Я$.

These eight inscc. are probably a little earlier.
(3) 39 and 47 are only plainly cut, and have a more open 8; 47 has ת, 39 5 and 9 and has no double letter in medix. If the archaeologists may be trusted, 47 dates from the 3 rd century B.C. (see the note) and the writing of this group is at all events older than that of the other. The fragment 56 should perhaps be put with them on account of its primitive material.

The magistrates mentioned in the Oscan period are
1 meddix tivtiks (44, 45, 47).
1 medix pimpaiians (39).
2 aidilis (39, 40, a single one in 53).
1 kvaisstur pimpaiians (42).
1 kvaisstur undefined (43, 49, 50, 52).
2 kvaizstur undefined (48).
${ }^{1}$ Wilmann's Exempla Inscc. Lat. 1821, 1838-40, or C. I. L. Ix. and x. sub locc.
${ }^{2}$ See Part II. A The Italic Alphabets, and cf. e.g. the inscc. of Pietrabbondante (168-174 inf.).

In 42,43 and 52 the quaestor acts kuimbennieis tanginud, but in 50 kurmparakineis.

For a possible distinction between the magistrates of the towu and of the league, see $p$. $\check{\text { on }}$.

The first recorded diggings at Pompeii were made in the years 1594 1600, when an aqueduct for Torre Annunziata was carried through the hillside, but no serious attempt was made to investigate the remains until the year 1748, when the accidental discovery of one or two columns and pictures roused the curiosity of Charles III. The amphitheatre and theatre were then uncovered, and thenceforward the hunt for works of art was resumed at frequent intervals, but the excavation was never conducted on any consistent plan until, in 1863, Fiorelli was appointed director and developed the careful system ${ }^{1}$ which has been since continuously carried on. According to his reckoning the whole city will be laid bare somewhere about 1950. The half that has been so far uncovered contains the forum, and, probably, most of the public buildings.

39-59 are cut in stone, 60-76 are painted, those in 77 are stamped on tiles, 78-86 are scratched with a stilus. They are all in the later Osc. aß, and the words are separated by a single interpunct in the middle of the line, unless it is otherwise stated.

[^15]
## 39-41 Road-makers' tablets.

39 Found in Pompeii in August 1851, close to the Porta Stabiana; now in the Naples Museum, where I read it in March 1894; phot. facsim. Zvet. Osc. tab. x. 5 and x. $a$. The punctuation is obvious except in $1.3, v . i n f$.
.siuttiis $m, n$ půntis $\underline{\underline{m}} \mid$ a]idilis ekak viam 3, 4 terem[na|t]tens. ant půnttram staf $[i \mid$ anam viu 5 te[r]emnatust per.|x. iussu via pumpaiiana ter| 6, 7 emnattens perek iII ant ka.|la iůveis meelikiieis.

Very regularly engraved on a block of travertine ${ }^{1}$ stone about 28 in . (broad) by 4 ft . high ( 70 by 1.2 m .), only the upper $21 \mathrm{in} .\left(53 \mathrm{~m}\right.$.) being covered by the inscc.; the letters $1 \frac{3}{4} \mathrm{in}$. ( 044 m .) high. There is no attempt at finials, the loops of f are very open, and once that of $d$.
l. 1 begins with the lower half of a vertical stroke, which may be $\mathbf{i}$ or the last of $\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{t}, \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{n}$ or $\mathbf{m}$; the interpunct is obliterated after siuttiis; the last letter may be $\mathbf{n}$ or m , only the n part is clear, and the two verticals are closer together than usually in n ; after it the corner is broken, and may have held at least 2 letters more, but the line need not have been filled to the end, just as one letter's space was possibly left at the beginning, unless the lost praenomen had two letters. 2 the second $\mathbf{k}$ is certain, though only its left-hand tip is left, since $V$ and $\upharpoonright$ are invariably carried to the top of the line, but this stroke, as regularly in $y$, is not ; ad fin, restored from 1. 6 . 3 p is quite gone and only the angle of u is left, $\mathfrak{i}$ is read because of Lat. pons, and there is a mark on the stone which may be a trace of the punct; the stop at teremnattens should perhaps be put at stafianam with Pauli, Altit. Stud. II, p. 109. 4 possibly one letter is lost at the end of the line. 5 the $u$ of ius might be $\mathfrak{u}$, the upper half is broken. 6 after the last a there is the end of a stroke slanting upwards, which does not reach the top of the line, and faint traces of a vertical after it ; it must, I think, be $\mathbf{i}$ with its thorn injured, unless the cross stroke be wholly accidental ; it is far too low to be $u . \quad 7$ the second 1 is $\downarrow$, and it would naturally be read $i l$, but there are

[^16]
## 8, 9 ekass vì|ass ini via iůvia ini dekkvia|rim med 10 ikeis půmpaianeis | serevkid imaden uupsens, iu [s| 11 su aidilis prưfattens.

no other conjunct letters in the insc. and the line is not crowded. 10 the $\mathbf{i}$ in id might conceivably have been $\mathbf{i}$; the last $\mathbf{u}$ has left only its right-hand tip.

Nissen Pompeianische Studien (Leipz. 1877) p. 532 ff., who gives notes from letters of Bücheler's; the latter has dealt with this insc. also in Jena Lit.-Zeitung 1874 p. 609, Rh. M. 1875 p. 446. Aufrecht K.Z. II. p. 55. Zvet. Osc. 62, Fabr. 2785.

40 Three stone fragments found in 1836, now in the Naples Museum, joined together, seen by me March 1894 ; phot. facsim. Zvet. Osc. tab. xiii. 9.

## p mat....... | aidil........ | teremnatte.. .mens viu pat

Regularly cut on a stone tablet with rather handsome border 13 in . high by 16 ( 32 by $\cdot 41 \mathrm{~m}$.), letters about $2 \mathrm{in}. \mathrm{( } 045 \mathrm{~m}$.) high. Osc. $a \beta$ with $\vdash$, but not $\mathcal{V}$ (viu is clear); the interpunct is broken away after the first word of 1. 4. The dots indicate the difference in length between the first three lines and the last, but all of them have lost a good deal more, by the breaking of the stone on the left; how much, it is not easy to say, but the plur. -mens shows that 1.1 must have contained the name of a second aedile, which would demand a space equal to at least six letters after pat. 1.1 only the tip of the vertical stroke of 1 remains, in 1.3 only the feet of the two $t$, and in 1.4 only the right-hand half of its cross. Bartholomae (Bezz. Beiträge XII. p. 85) would restore *pattens, which will hardly do with the nom. Viu; better would be pattust 'passa, patefacta est'; Nissen (Pompeian. Stud. p. 536) patit perek (e.g. x.).

Nissen l.c., U. D. p. 182, Zvet. Osc. 73, Fabr. 2790.

41 Found October 1875, now in the Naples Museum, seen by me March 1894; phot. facs. Zvet. Osc. tab. xiv. 1.
....p ni ma... | ...iam saa.... | ...ttens

On a fragment of stone precisely similar to the last in style, only that there is less of it ( 8 in . by $10,=\cdot 2$ by 25 m .). 1.2 only $]$ is left of the last $a$, in 1.3 only the cross of the first $t$. In $1.1 p$ is no doubt the praenomen of the father of the first building-officer, ni (umsis) the praen. of the second. Zvet. Osc. 75.

42-55 Dedication or foundation stones.
42 Found in 1797 in Pompeii, now in the Museum at Naples, seen by me March 1894 ; phot. facsim. Zvet. Osc. tab. xi.
v aadirans $v$ eitiuvam paam | vereiiai půmpaii
3, 4 anai tristaa|mentud deded, eisak eitiuvad | v 5 viinikiis mr kvaisstur půmplaiians triibům ekak $6,7 \mathrm{kůmben} \mid$ nieis tanginud ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{p}$ sannam | deded, isidum průfatted.

A splendidly engraved travertine ${ }^{1}$ tablet, 16 in. by 30 ( 405 by $\cdot 76 \mathrm{~m}$.), the letters $1 \frac{3}{4} \mathrm{in}$. ( 045 m .) high and (once) coloured red, the most perfect specimen we have of the latest Osc. $a \beta$. It is curious that conjunct letters should appear only in pů maiianai, and even in that word only the first time that it occurs ${ }^{2}$. The insc. was built into the back wall of a court known as the Curia Isiaca, which on the other three sides is surrounded by pillars ( 8 on either hand, 5 in front), and measures 22 by 16 feet. The insc. no doubt refers to the Curia, though many of the inscribed stones of Pompeii have nothing to do with the buildings in which ultimately they came to be set. Behind the wall was the temple of Isis, which, as we know from C. I. L. x. 846 , was restored after the earthquake in 63 A.D. Nissen (Pomp. Stud. p. 158 ff .) gives an interesting description of the Curia, bolding that it was a palaestra, and concluding from the architecture that it is pre-Sullan; the same thing is no doubt implied by the mention of the kvaisstur pumpaians; see p. 55 f.

Between two pillars of the court was the statue of a doryphoros with a Latin insc. (C. I. L. x. 851) stating that it was erected by one M. Lucretius Decidianus, and restored by a descendant. From other inscc. (ib. 788,

[^17]$789,815)$ it appears that Decid. himself lived before A.D. 14, and that the restoration took place after the earthquake in 63 A.D. Hence Buck (Osk. Vocalism. p. 5) seems to conclude that our insc. is later than 63. This is clearly true of the copy in its present position, but proves nothing as to the original ; indeed since the court must have been there before the statue, this alone would show that about A.D. 14 was a lower limit of date for the Oscan insc.

Nissen l.c., Momm. U. D. p. 183, Zvet. Osc. 63, Fabr. 2791.

43 Dug up in the Thermae Stabianae, 1854, now in the Naples Museum, seen by me March 1894; phot. facsim. Zvet. Osc. tab. xiii. 2 (ef. xii. 2).

## mr atiniis mr kvaisstur eitiuvad | můltasikad kůmbennieis tang[in | aaman[a]ffed.

Simply engraved beneath a sun-dial of Travertine stone, letters rather over $\frac{1}{2} \mathrm{in}$. ( 013 m .) high; in the centre the stone is damaged. The loops of $\mathbf{f}$ are not quite closed, but that of $d$ is. 1.1 the second $t$ has lost its cross and appears as $\mathcal{J}$, no doubt a mistake in the graving; the conjunct letter at the end is due to crowding. 1. 2 perhaps tang[inud], but if the line matched 1.1 there is only room for [in.

Corssen K. Z. xı. p. 334, Zvet. Osc. 66, Fabr. 2794.

44 Found in September 1838 in a house in the Strada dei mercanti, now in the Naples Museum, seen by me March 1894; phot. facsim. Zvet. Osc. tab. xii. 3.

## v půpidiis v med tiov | passtata ekak ůpsan | deded, isi̊du průfattd.

Regularly but not finely cut on a corniced block of Travertine 10 in . high by 24 ( 245 by 59 m .), letters $1 \frac{1}{2} \mathrm{in}$. ( 04 m .) long; $f$ is quite open, and some examples of $\boldsymbol{d}$. The Popidii were Pompeians, but the office here mentioned seems to belong to the Nucerine league (see p. 51). Cf. V. Popidius Ep. f. q. porticus faciendas coeravit C. I. L. x. 794 ( $=I^{1} .1249$ ), an insc. found in the forum of Pompeii and relating to the colonnade round it, the $a \beta$ of which cannot be much later than Sulla (see p. 55 sup.). The first editor (Avellino) did not see the dot of the first $\mathcal{V}$ in 1. 1, nor the thorn of the firstト in 1.3 , but they are now clear; e is omitted in the last
word of the insc. for want of space; the last letter is $d$, not $r$ as in Avell.'s text. I could see no interpunct at the end of 11.1 and 3 , but there is certainly one at the end of 1.2.
U. D. p. 180, Zvet. Osc. 65, Fabr. 2786.

45 Found in June 1813 over the inner arch of the north-eastern or Nola-gate, now in the Brit. Mus. ; phot. facsim. Zvet. Osc. tab. xiii. 1.

## v půpidiis v | med ti̊v | aamanaffed, | isidu | pruifatted.

On a marble slab 17 in . long by 11 high ( 425 by $\cdot 275 \mathrm{~m}$.), with letters $1 \frac{3}{4} \mathrm{in}$. ( 044 m .) high, formerly attached to a larger block of tufa stone, on which was a finely carved female head, with heavy tresses of hair falling on either side, like the heads above the gate of the amphitheatre at Capua; Nissen (Pomp. Stud. p. 511) calls her the 'Stadtgöttin' (cf. also p. 339). Some of the early editors concluded from the (now) broken edges of the slab that it had nothing to do with the sculpture, but had been built in by chance ; but if so, the masons would have had the decency to turn the inscribed side out of sight, or at least to set it in a less conspicuous position. $f$ has open loops but not $d$. The insc. is finely carved, in perfect preservation; the lines are unequal because the words are not divided. Momm. U. D. p. 181, Zvet. Osc. 64, Fabr. 2787.

46 Found in the atrium of the casa del Fauno, 1831, now in the Naples Museum, seen by me March 1894; woodeut of rubbing in Zvet. Osc. tab. xiii. 3.

## fluusai.

Finely engraved on a tiny altar $10 \frac{1}{2} \mathrm{in}$. high by $5 \frac{1}{2}$ broad ( 263 by $\cdot 138 \mathrm{~m}$.), letters $\frac{4}{5} \mathrm{in}$. high ( .020 m .). f has open loops. With it was found a bronze statuette which has since disappeared.

The interior of the casa is older than its second or outer peristyle, which belongs to the latest development of the style of the Basilica (a building which dates from the Sullan epoch, having nothing but Latin inscc., C. I. L. IV. 1780-1952). But on these very outer walls are several Oscan graffiti (79-81, 84-5), and hence Mommsen (U. D. p. 188) inferred that the house belonged to an old Oscan family, by whom the language was kept up a good deal later than it was in the city generally. See Mau Bull. Inst. Arch. Rom. 1875, p. 62.

Momms. U. D. p. 180, Zvet. Osc. 67, Fabr. 2793.

47 Found in May 1796 in $\pm$ small circular Doric temple of eight pillars known $=$ the bidental, of which this block (of travertine) formed part of the epistyle; now in the Naples Museum, where I read it in March 1894; phot. facsim. Zvet. Osc. tab. ziii. 5.

## ni trebiis tr med tův | aamanaffed

Regularly cut, Petters about $2 \frac{1}{4} \mathrm{in}$. ( 055 m .) high; the loops of b fand d are open. In the centre of the temple was a small round altar, which has been regarded as a puteal or a bidental, but without sufficient reason, see Mommsen U. D. p. 182 and Nissen Pomp. Stud. p. 338, who assigns it to the 3rd century B.c. (p. 671).
U. D. p. 182, Zvet. Osc. 69, Fabr. 2788.

43 Found in April 1893 in the casa of Cornelius Rufus in the Strada dell ${ }^{\prime}$ Abbondanza Reg. vii. 4. no. 14, and now in the Museum at Naples, where I read it in March 1894; published by Sogliano in Not. Scav. 1893, p. 212, also in Mittheil. Deutsch. Arch. Inst. Rom. 1894, p. 61.

## mx avdiis kli | dekis seppiis

## ůpf | kvaizstur upsens

Evenly but not finely cut in full Osc. $a \beta$ with regular central interpunct on a small square pedestal of travertine ( 46 m . by 48 by 26 high) with three square sockets in its flat top, in which pieces of mortar are left; it was found with its face turned to the wall, in the space beneath the staircase. The insc. is complete and all the letters are perfectly clear. Between $\mathbf{k}$ and 1 in 1.1 there is a punct which is certainly accidental, as it is neither so deep, so round, nor so near the centre of the line as the rest.

The insc. is noteworthy in one or two respects. mz had not been recognised elsewhere, though it really occurs in 176 inf . It seems to represent either *Matos, the source of the gens Matia (from Campanian and Pelignian territory, 155 C. and 242 C.) or the Osc. for Lat. (Sabine) Mettus, the original of Osc. metiis. kvaizstur would seem to be plur., but hitherto we have had no trace of two quaestors in Pompeii, see p. 56. Unless we have here a private person joining with an official, for which I
know no parallel, this insc. proves that at some time or otherbetween $250-100$ B.c., as the thoroughly good style of the writing shows-there were two quaestors. The spelling -zstis curious-is it really phonetic or a mere freak, following cenzstur, where the $z$ had a phonetic origin between $n$ and $s$ (Brugm. Gds. I. § 209)?

49 Found in 1818 in the Strada dei mercanti, now in the Naples Museum, where I read it in 1894; phot. facsim. Zvet. Osc. tab. xiii. 6.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text {...k]vaisstur | ...t]anginud | ...u deded | } \\
& \text {..ekhad | ...profa]tted }
\end{aligned}
$$

About 10 in . ( 243 m .) of the left-hand end of a slab of travertine 15 in. ( 38 m .) high, the letters $1 \frac{5}{8} \mathrm{in}$. ( $\cdot 040 \mathrm{~m}$.) high, finely cut and coloured red; interp. in 1.3. From 10 to 20 letters are probably missing at the beginning of each line, to judge from the first, which no doubt has lost merely the name of the quaestor; cf. the preceding inscc.

$$
\text { U. D. p. 184, Zvet. Osc. 70, Fabr. } 2789 .
$$

50 Found in two fragments in 1831 and 1841 respectively in rooms adjoining the atrium of the casa del Fauno; now in the Naples Museum, where I read it in 1894; phot. facsim. Zvet. Osc. xiii. 7.
...]puriis ma | k]vaisstur |ki̊]mparakineis | ta]ngin aamanaffed

Boldly, but not quite evenly cut in a slab of travertine, about 15 in . high and (now) 17 in . long ( 383 by 420 m .), the letters about 2 in . ( 05 m .) long; interp. in 11.1 and 4 ; the letters have finials and the loops of $d$ and $f$ are closed. 1. 1 Zvet. plausibly suggests $s p u r i i s$; for the $r$ of. Verner's Law in Italy, p. 70. 1. 2 ends and no doubt began a letter or two short of the rest, 1.4 is rather squeezed, in spite of the abbreviation and the conjunct letters; the $\mathbf{d}$ has lost its tail.
U. D. p. 183, Zvet. Osc. 71, Fabr. 2792.

51 Found in 1873; now in the Naples Museum where I saw it in March 1894, phot. facsim. Zvet. Osc. tab. xiii. 8.

$$
\text { ...i̊ps]ann... | ..e] }{ }_{\underline{k}}^{\underline{k} a d . . . ~ \mid ~ . . . p r u ̊] f a t[t e d ~}
$$

The fragment measures about $4 \frac{1}{4}$ by $2 \frac{1}{2} \mathrm{in}$. ( 106 by $\cdot 062 \mathrm{~m}$.), the letters $1 \frac{1}{\mathrm{~s}} \mathrm{in}$. ( 028 m .) high. The left-hand side is straight, upsann is a common abbreviation and there is no interpunct after ekad, though there is plenty of room, and this word therefore probably ended a line; but pruifatted would be abbreviated rather priftd (cf. průfts=pruifattens) than profot, and therefore probably the stone has been sawn off three letters' space from the end, the last line but one being shorter than the rest, as in no. 45. Zvet. Osc. 72.

52 Found in 1882 in the sanctuary of the ternple of Apollo, commonly called the temple of Venus, now in the Naples Museum where I read it in March 1894; published by Mau, Bull. Inst. Arch. Rom. 1882, p. 223.

## u kamp.....kvais]stůr kůmbenn[ieis tangin] appelluneis eitiu[vad.. .. íps]annu aaman[aff]ed

One line of letters 2 in . high, 8 ft .6 in . long ( 2.55 m .), stamped by successive dots in the square margin of a part of the pavement of the cella. The thorn of I is nowhere clear but the punct of $\dot{u}$ is, in all three cases. 10 letters are missing in the first gap, 10 in the second, about 16 in the third, and 3 in the last. It is only by degrees that so much of the text has been read (cf. Mau l.c. pp. 189 and 205); Mau saw a letter or two more of the words restored when the insc. was in situ, than I could in the Museum.

For a deity as paymaster, cf. C. I. L. $\mathrm{I}^{1} .569(=\mathrm{x} .378)$ porticum...et loc(um) privat(um) de stipe Dian(ae) emendum...coeravere.

Büch. Rh. Mus. 1882, p. 643, Jordan Symb. ad histor. relig. Italic., Königsberg 1883, p. 16, Zvet. Inscc. Ital. Infer. Dial. 156 a.

53 Found in Aug. 1865 in the casa del Fauno, now in the Naples Museum; phot. facsim. Zvet. Osc. tab. xiii. 4.

## v sadiriis v aidil

Boldly cut on a fragment of a basis ${ }^{1}$ of travertine, about 32 in . ( 810 m .) long, the letters of the usual height ( $1 \frac{8}{8} \mathrm{in} .=040 \mathrm{~m}$.) ; the interpunct
${ }^{1}$ Not an epistyle; the supposed cornice is below the letters and projects so far that it would have completely concealed them from an observer on a lower level.
is wanting after aidil, this form therefore is the last word of the line; is it the nominative sing. in full or an abbreviation? There is plenty of room for another letter or two. Zvet. Osc. 68, Fabr. 2819 a.

54 Two fragments of Travertine stone found in May 1868, now in the Naples Museum, seen by me March 1894; facsim. Zvet. Osc. tab. xiv. 2.

## $\underline{\underline{m} r}$ pů[p]idiis mr|pů.....an.

Letters well made, $1 \frac{1}{8} \mathrm{in}$. ( $\cdot 028 \mathrm{~m}$.) high, but now so worn that they can hardly be read; the stones together are 4 by $11 \frac{1}{2} \mathrm{in}$. ( 100 by $\cdot 290 \mathrm{~m}$.). There is a faint mark before in 1. 2, and after u apparently | (? a). Zvet. Osc. 76. Fabr. 2819 b.

55 In 1875 was in promptuario Mus. Pompeiani; phot. facsim. Zvet. Osc. tab. xiv. 3.

## epid

Boldly cut ( $\cdot 040 \mathrm{~m} .=1 \frac{5}{8} \mathrm{in}$. high) on n fragment of a handsome epistyle. Sueton. Rhet. 4 mentions a certain Epidius of Nuceria who was said to have been drowned in the Sarnus and afterwards counted as a river-god. But the name is a common one in Campania, v. infr. no. 155 A and cf. the inscr. quoted in the note to no. 44. Zvet. Osc. 77, Fabr. Suppl. 1, n. 505.

56 Found 1847, now in the Naples Museum, where I saw it; phot. Zvet. Osc. tab. xiv. 4.

$$
\underset{\sim}{m r n i}
$$

In huge letters ( $4 \frac{1}{2} \mathrm{in} .=\cdot 115 \mathrm{~m}$. high) deeply cut and painted red and apparently a complete word, on a block of limestone ${ }^{1}$, the only example of an insc. on this material (Nissen Pomp. Stud. p. 13) which was superseded by the harder kind of tufa. Fiorelli, Giorn. Scav. Pomp. 1850 dispens, ri. p. xix., read an interpunct after the $\mathbf{r}$ but the hole seems shallow and accidental. Zvet. Osc. 78, Fabr. Suppl. 1, no. 504.

Note vi. On a small circular altar of marble whose surface had been much broken, standing in the Casa della piccola Fontana (Reg. vi. Ins. 8 no. 23),
${ }^{1}$ Not tufa, as is generally stated.

I noticed what appeared to be the remains of letters $\frac{1}{2} \mathrm{in}$. high ( $\cdot 012 \mathrm{~m}$. ).
...kil.. or ..dil..
but they and still more the remains of what I took to be a line beneath them were too faint to be read with certainty. They are only given here in the hope that a keener eye may some day detect more.

## 57 The mensa ponderaria.

Found in a niche of the wall at the back of the forum (cf. Momm. ad C. I. L. x. 787) in 1816, now in the Naples Museum; facsim. Zvet. Osc. xiII. $10 a$ and $b$, another by Mommsen C. I. L. x. 793; the text from these, and from an impression kindly sent me by Mr E. N. Rolfe, of Naples, which I compared with the original in March 1894.

| a. (illegible) | c. (illegible) |
| :--- | :--- |
| b. .iasiis | d. kůinik.. |

e. seb...ik

Engraved respectively, in the latest Osc. a $\beta$, beneath five circular cavities of graduated size (with small holes pierced at the bottom) in a tablet of travertine 22 in . by $88(0.552$ by 2.225 m .), that is to say exactly 2 by 8 Oscan feet ( 275 m .), for which see below; the letters nearly 2 in . ( 04 m .) high ${ }^{1}$. In the corners of the tablet are two pairs of much smaller hollows, two of which are cut into the beginning of ( $\alpha$ ) and the end of (e), and must have been later additions. The Osc. words were intentionally defaced in antiquity.

Of (a) Zvet. gives NI (ia, not in which would be HI), Mommsen only I; there is room for 3 or 4 letters on both sides (the right-hand space being measured as it was before the corner cavity was made, which, as it is, leaves room for only one letter). (b) init. Momm. and Rolfe give 7, Zvet. only the curved stroke of this, but reads the whole word as diasiis ; only the ias and the final is are certain ; the first letter is practically hopeless, but the remains look like b more than any other letter. (c) only four vertical strokes, two at the beginning (Zvet. adds a horizontal stroke above them, 7), and two in the middle of the line, with space for about 2 letters on either side of them. (d) Momm, -nik., Zvet. -niks; the first syllable is certain, and after the second $\mathbf{k}$, which is fairly certain, at least two symbols have been erased, which may have been numerals; all
${ }^{1}$ Zvet. gives the height of the letters $=47 \mathrm{~m}$., $=$ clerical error for $\cdot 047$.
that is left of them are the top fragments of two verticals. (e) Momm. seb.ik, Zvet. sebsig , the $\mathbf{k}$ close upon the corner cavity. The left-hand side of the $b$ is injured and it may possibly have been an $\mathbf{h}(日)$. There seems to be a vertical after it so that sebisik or sebdik or sebrik are possible ; no part of the word is certain except se....k; i or $\mathbf{l}$ equally possible.

The tablet is a standard for measures of capacity; but it is difficult, indeed impossible, to determine what their relation is to the erased Oscan names. What they were themselves has at last been precisely determined by my friend Mr G. P. Bidder, formerly of Trinity College, Cambridge, and now of the Zoological Station, Naples, who has very kindly measured the contents of the cavities ( $\alpha, b, c, d, e, f, g$ ) for me, and, omitting the duplicates of the two smallest ( $f, g$ ), the result is that almost exactly
as

$$
\begin{aligned}
& g: f: e: d: c: b: a, \\
& \frac{1}{2}: 1: 8: 16: 24: 36: 48,
\end{aligned}
$$

where unity $=593 \pm 3$ litres. Hence it seems clear that we have before us standards at least corresponding to the Roman measures of capacity, as follows :

| $g$ | hemina | $=\frac{1}{2}$ sextarius, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $f$ | sextarius |  |
| $e$ | semodius | = 8 sextarii, |
| $d$ | modius | $=16$ sextarii, |
| c | urna or 4 congii | $=24$ sextarii, |
| $b$ | $\dot{\eta} \mu<\mu \in \tau \rho \eta^{\prime} \tau \eta s$ or 6 congii | = 36 sextarii, |
|  | amphora or quadrantal | $=48$ sextari |

This seems confirmed, if any confirmation be needed, by the fact that the outlet-holes of $\alpha$ and $d$ measure 013 m . in diameter, of the rest only -004, probably because the modius and quadrantal were used for grainmeasures, the rest only for liquids. The values hitherto deduced for the sextarius vary from 536 to 576 litres. (Hultsch Metrologie ${ }^{2}$ p. 118 ff .)

For further details, including the determination of the Oscan pound, see the Appendix.

A Lat. insc. on the back (C. I. L. x. 793) shows that the measures have undergone a modification: A. Clodius A. f. Flaccus, N. Arcaeus N. f. Arellian(us) Caledus $d\left(u_{0}\right) v($ iri $) ~ i(u r e) d(i c u n d o)$ mensuras exaequandas ex dec(urionum) decr(eto). Now this A. Clodius was duovir a third time in B.c. 3-2 (C. I. L. x. 890), so that this, his first tenure of the office, cannot be later than 14 b.c., since municipal duoviri could not hold their office twice within a quinquennium (cf. Nissen Pomp. Stud. p. 72). The Lat. insc. therefore belongs to the general equalisation of coinage, weights etc. which followed the establishment of the empire.

58-76 Inscriptions on outside walls, at street corners, etc.

> (58-59 bis are cut, the rest are painted in red.)

58 On a tufa-pillar of a house, reg. 7, ins. 4, no. 60, Zvet. Osc. tab. xiv. 5, no. 79.

## suv

59 Found in 1823, now in the Naples museum, seen by me March 1894 ; facsim. Fior. Mon. Ep. Pomp. x. 2, Zvet. Osc. xvii. 2.

## ahvdiuni akun cxir

Letters $3 \frac{1}{2} \mathrm{in}$. ( 087 m .) high, squarely and rather elegantly cut in plaster and then coloured; a small square serves instead of the usual interpunct; the $C$ is joined to the $X, X$. U. D. p. 188, Zvet. Osc. 92, Fabr. 2806.

59 bis $\quad=$ C. I. L. x. 8066. $5,6,8$. On the top of bases on to which the basins of fountains were afterwards fitted, so as to cover these signs, which are clearly mason's marks (Mau Mittheil. Rom. 1895 p. 49).
(a) k s $\mathbf{V}$
(b) $\mathbf{k ~ m}$
(c) $\mathbf{k}$ mta.

60 Painted on a pillar of tufa stone close to the corner of the Vico del Narcisso leading from the Strada Consolare to the N.W. wall (reg.6, ins. 2, no. 4), uncovered in 1797, now quite illegible, but preserved in the facsim. of Fiorelli taken in 1847, Mon. Epigr. Pomp. tab. vi, 1, whence this text. Zvet. Osc. tab. xiv. 7 gives a photograph of greatly reduced size.

## eksuk amvianud eituns | anter tiurri xil ini ver | sarnnu puf faamat | mr aadiriis $v$

Roughly painted in red, covering a space of about 59 in . long by 17 ( $1 \cdot 47$ by $\cdot 42 \mathrm{~m}$.), the letters from 3 to 4 in . high ( 075 to $\cdot 100 \mathrm{~m}$.), in Osc. $a \beta$ with I but not $\stackrel{\circ}{\mathrm{u}}$, whose absence however is certainly not an indication of
early date : interp. regular. 1. 2 reached to the edge, hence the abbreviation. In 1. 3 instead of Fior.'s sarinu I print the form which appeared to me most probable in the nea. insc., which I saw. It is supported to some extent by porta Volturn. at Capua, C. I. L. x. 3913. There is no attempt at any finish in the formation of the letters, though the horizontal line is well kept.

The painted inscc. must have been in good condition when Pompeii was overwhelmed in 79 A.D., and hence show that Oscan was spoken there till well within the lst century A.D.

Many guesses have been made as to the meaning of these four eitunsinscriptions; Mommsen suggested, reasonably enough, that they must be advertisements of some kind; cf. Conway, Idg. Forschungen III. p. 85. Nissen (Pomp. Stud. p. 498 ff.) thought they were military notices dating from 90 в.c.! Bücheler has written a few words on the inscc. in $R h$. Mus. xxxiII. p. 41, and apud Nissen l.c. p. 498.
U. D. p. 185, Zvet. Osc. 80, Fabr. 2795.

61 About 10 feet up from the ground on a tufa pillar, the next but one to the corner of the Vico $d$. Fullonica leading from the Str. d. Terme (a continuation of the Str. Consolare) to the N.W. wall (reg. 6, ins. 6, n. 3), where I read it in April 1894; first read by Lepsius about 1840 .

## eksuk amvianud eit | anter tiurri xir ini | veru sarnuu puf|faamat $m r$ aadiriis $v$

Like 60 in all respects, save that the pillar was 9 in . ( 225 m .) narrower, and therefore the insc. as a whole is perforce somewhat cramped, and eituns abbreviated in deference to the custom which forbad a word to be divided between 2 lines. 1.1 is clear; between amvian and $u d$ are two large spots of black paint which must have been there before the insc. 1. 2 ti- not ti-. 1.3 the thorn of the $I$ of the old reading sarinu is not at all clear, and there is a space between the vertical and the next $\mathbf{n}$ with an oblique stroke and traces of another vertical before it, so that sarnnu seems almost certain.

$$
\text { U. D. p. 185, Zvet. Osc. 81, Fabr. } 2796 .
$$

62 At the same height on the corner pillar of the Str. d. Terme and the Vico d. Fauno which leads to the N.W. wall (reg. 12, ins. 6, nos. 23-25), first published by Corssen in 1873; facsim. made by Zvet. in 1875, given Osc. tab. xvi. 1. I saw it in April 1894, but only fisanis is now clear.

## ek[s]uk amvianud eitu | ant tiurr]ị $x$ ini xi puf | faama]t t fisanis u

1. 1 s had completely vanished. 1.2 init. in Zvet.'s copy there is space for 9 to 12 letters, not more. 1.3 the first $t$ had lost its cross; before it space for 5 or 6 letters. The interpunct was lost in 1.1 before eitu, 1.2 before $\mathrm{xi}, 1.3$ before u .

Zvet. Osc. $83^{11}$. Schöne's copy, given by Corssen Eph. Ep. II. p. 172, no. 30 , is worthless.

63 About the same height up on the corner pillar of the Vico d. Terme and the V. d. Soprastanti which leads from the N. end of the forum to the W. wall (reg. 7, ins. 7), uncovered about 1820, first read in 1873. Zvet. Osc. tab. xv. gives facsim. made by de Petra taken in 1875 and verified by himself. Earlier copies were inaccurate. It was still in fair preservation in April 1894 when I read it.

## eksuk amv[i] anud | eituns an[ter tr]iibu | ma kastrikiieis ini|mr.spurneis l| puf faamat|v sehsimbriis 1

The first line is now almost completely gone, the second is clear save for the letters in brackets; the third clear ; in the fourth as it is now ii might be read for $\mathbf{n}$ since the strokes are nearer together than are those of $\mathbf{n}$ usually. In 1.6 sehsimbr (not sehs imbr) is quite clear; then follows A $\backslash$ l, clearly the lower halves of iis and either 1 or a smudged $\mathbf{v}$; de Petra's reading -brar is I think impossible. I see no reason for separating sehs from the following letters; the $\boldsymbol{i}$ is all but joined on to it, and as there is plenty of room on the stone after the 1 there is no ground for supposing with Nissen and Biich. the abbreviation of imperator into 'imbrtr' (!). As to sehsimbriis ('Sexembrius'?) v. Idg. Forschungen III. p. 86 footn.

Zvet. Osc. 82, Nissen, Pomp. Stud. p. 500.
${ }^{1}$ Zvet. states that the letters are 97 m . high, \& slip for $\cdot 097$.

64-66 On tufa pillars of the house at the corner of the Str. d. Teatri and the Str. d. Fontana d' Abbondanza; facsim. in Fiorelli Mon. Ep. Pomp. vii. 1, 2, 3, whence this text, and Zvet. Osc. xvi. 2, 3, 6, greatly reduced.

Among them are sprinkled Lat. insce. of which the most legible are, M. Marium aed. faci. oro uos, and Artor. Vest. faciat. aed. m. ma.

## 64

 ma herenni | llll|ldẹdeiưOn the fourth pillar from the corner in the Str. de' Teatri, now illegible. The letters were 9 in , high ( 225 m .), with regular interpuncts, even after all the seven abbreviations in 1. 2, where the first $\mathbb{d}$ Momm. read as 'perhaps ni-s' e has lost its base line (7).
U. D. p. 186, tab. xi. $29 f, 1$, Zvet. Osc. 84, Fabr. 2797.

65 1 ํpi...n | nied....

On the fifth pillar from the corner in the same street. Letters about 6 in. ( 15 m .) high. Momm. ( $U$. D. tab. xi. $29 \mathrm{f}, 2$ ) saw rather more than Fiorelli; of the $\mathfrak{n}$ and $\mathbb{d}$ only $\wedge$ and , remained, and now hardly anything at all.
U. D. p. 187, Zvet. Osc. 89, Fabr. 2801.
pikůf n. x

On the corner pillar on the face in the Str. della Fontana, where in 1894 it was still just legible, except the numeral. Letters 9 in. high ( $\cdot 225 \mathrm{~m}$.). No interpunct after $\mathbf{f}$, but room for one; after $\mathbf{n}$ a quite illegible blotch; $\mathbf{X}$ is smudged but fairly clear in the facsimile, though it might be $\mathbf{k}$. For a suggestion as to the meaning see Classical Review viI. p. 468.

67 On a tufa pillar in the Str. d. Font. d' Abbond. near the forum; first read about 1820, and in April 1894 still fairly well preserved; Fior. Mon. Ep. Pomp. ix. ; Zvet. Osc. xvi. 4.

## mr perkhen | IIII ner d.. | labiku niel.. | |ll| seis

## aphinis | altinům

Rough letters, 5-6in. ( 135 m .) high ; 5 lines only, not 6 as the earlier editors supposed; 日 is rounded into $\theta$. l. $2 \mathbf{r}$ is $(\mathbb{J}$, after $\mathbf{r}$ there is a punct, and $I$ doubt if it was ever $\mathbf{i}$; after $\mathbf{d}$ a hasta, and at the end of the line possibly $m$. 1.31 is certain; $i$ might be $i$; ' $k$ might be $d$ ' (Momm.); after 1 possibly sa or st. 4 the thorn of $\$ has now vanished. The rest is still clear, save that $\mathbf{i}$ in altinum might be $\mathbf{1}$. Beside the insc. is the Lat. formula, often occurring on election-placards for the Quattuorvirate, but not yet explained, v. a. s. p. p. (Momm. C. I. L. x. p. 93.)
U. D. p. 186, Zvet. Osc. 86, Fabr. 2802.

68 On the corner tufa pillar next to that on which no. 59 is painted. Fiorelli Mon. E. P. viii. 1, Zvet. Osc. xvi, 6. Now quite washed out (March, 1894).

## p kiipiis

More carefully painted than the preceding inscc., letters $3-4 \mathrm{in}$. ( 085 m .) high, interpunct after p. U. D. p. 186, Zvet. Osc. 88, Fabr. 2799.

69 On the next tufa pillar to no. Dis supr., first read about 1820; Fior. viii. 3, Zvet. Osc. xvi. 8 (who places it wrongly in the Str. d. Teatri). Now quite gone.
l.ůe...n | idn e erk

Letters $5 \frac{1}{2} \mathrm{in}$. high ( $\cdot 137 \mathrm{~m}$.), interpunct after 1 and idn ; after the first e of 1.2 Lepsius (Insec. Umb. et Osc. xxii. 10) read an a; at this point is a slight break in the stone, interrupting both lines after their first $\mathbf{e}$; 'the $\mathbf{k}$ might be $\mathbf{n}$ ' (Momm.).
U. D. p. 186, Zvet. Osc. 90, Fabr. 2800.

70 On four of the fluted tufa columns which bound the forum (cf. C. I. L. x. 794, quoted above no. 44), fairly high up, first read in 1850 but has now disappeared ; Fior. x. 1, Zvet. (with photograph of pillars) Osc. xvii. 1.

## vaamunim

Carefully painted, letters $7 \frac{1}{2} \mathrm{in}$. ( 387 m .) high; underneath it, on one pillar, VICTORIA. I take the Osc. word to denote the part of the forum at which bail (uadimonium) was 'answered to' ('sistebatur').

Zvet. Osc. 91, Fabr. 2803.

71 On a tufa pillar of reg. 7, ins. 4, n. 59. Zvet. Osc. xvii. 3, taken in Sept. 1875 ; I did not succeed in finding it in April, 1894.

## $\nabla \quad \mid \mathrm{p}$ afillis

The letter of the first line was 6 in . ( 15 m .) high, the rest 5 in . ( 125 m .); there was no trace of any other letters after the $\mathbf{V}$ in the facsimile but they may have been washed off; interpunct after $\mathbf{p}$. It was wrongly read $a$. $a$. silli by earlier editors. Zvet. Osc. 93, Fabr. Suppl. 3, no. 427.

72 Seen by me in April 1894 on the corner pillar of the Casa dei Diadumeni (reg. 9, ins. 3) in the Strada of the same name, but so far as I know not yet published; only a few letters are left of an inse. in red paint in the same style as the rest.
...mah... | ihi..
$\mathbf{h}$ in 1.2 is $H$, after the second $\mathbf{i}$ is something like $\mathfrak{u} t$, but too obscure to be certainly read.

72 bis On a tufa pillar of reg. 7, ins. 9, 58, 59 (east side), first read in 1873, now vanished. Zvet. Osc. xvii. 4.
..iot ni | ....uk.n

A mere fragment, the letters 9 in . ( 22 m .) high. Before ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{U}$ t is ( $\pi_{\text {which has }}$ been read ar; interpunct before and after ni. There are two doubtful signs left before the $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{k}$ is $>$ which looks hardly big enough for $\mathbf{g}(>)$. Zvet. Osc. 94 .

Note vii. Corssen (Eph. Ep. I1. p. 175) gives from a sketch of Schöne (1873), as being painted on I tufa pillar of no. 37 in the Str. d. Mercurio,

## skiru?

which neither Zvet. nor Sogliano nor I have been able to find, so that the reading rests on Schöne's authority only. Zvet. Osc. 98.

In the Str. d. Font. d' Abbond. n. 15 and 16 respectively were the fragments

$$
1111 \mathrm{n}
$$

Zvet. Osc. 99, 100.
III

73-76 Inscriptions painted on plaster.

73 On an outside wall of the casa del Fauno, in large letters now lost; Zvet. Osc. 87, tab. xvi. 5.

## ifi

74 In the casa di Pomponio in the Str. di Mercurio, first read about 1820, now no longer visible; facsim. Fior. Mon. Ep. Pomp. x. 15̃, Zvet. Osc. xvii. 5.

## emens meliissaii.... Il.ig.paarigtis

Letters $\frac{3}{4} \mathrm{in}$. ( 018 m .) high and regular; in the first half of the line the letters marked as injured had little more than faint outlines, but the second was elear from p onwards. For Melissaeus ef. no. 155 A infr. U. D. p. 187 (from Lepsius), Zvet. Osc. 95, Fabr. 2805.

75 In the casa d. Medusa in the Str. di Mercurio; first read by Mommsen about 1847; Fior. Mon. Ep. Pomp. x. 14, Zvet. Osc. xvii. 6. I could not find it.

## maamieise mefitaiiais | ...... i̊kin

Letters $\frac{1}{4} \mathrm{in} .(.006 \mathrm{~m}$.) high; S is rounded but $\mathbf{n}$ and $I I$ have the pure Oscan form ; all the facsim. of 1.1 are perfectly clear, but the ending of the first word
as it stands is certainly not Oscan. Momm. adds that there may have been once another line of letters above this. For Mammius of, no. 155 A infr. $U . D$. p. 187, Zvet. Osc. 96, Fabr. 2804.

76 On rough plaster covering an outer wall of Sarnus-stone (reg. 6, ins. 14); Zvet. Osc. 101 repeats the text from Sogliano, Notigl. Scav. 1876-7, p. 243. I could not find it.
l veat.... pisu

In large letters, amid several Lat. insce. both painted and scratched; the former include two or three election-programmata, e.g. M. Samellium Modestum aed. o(ro) f(aciatis).

## 77 Inscriptions on tiles found in Pompeii.

These have been carefully edited and described by Dressel and Mommsen, C. I. L. X. 8042, nos. 103 and $140-164$, to which the reader may be referred in case of need. The details have a purely archaeological value, and therefore are not repeated here, but to each insc. is added its number in Mommsen's list. Zvet. Osc. $102-116$ is a less complete and less authoritative account; Inscc. It. Inf. no. 181-206 is an abridgment of Mommsen's. Fabretti's (2802-2124 circa, Suppl. I. 502 ff.) is quite incomplete.

Where the words or letters are separated in the text there is an interpunct in the original.
A. On tiles of which we have more than one specimen.

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
1(=150) \text { ni lare... }(\mathrm{n}=\mathrm{N}) & 2(=157) \text { l tittil } \\
3(=158) \text { dek tre } & 4(=159) \text { d t } \\
5(=145) \text { v bra } & 6(=146) \text { d } \\
7(=155) \text { n r }(\mathrm{n}=\mathrm{N}) & 8(=156) \text { pr t } \\
9(=164) \text { a } & 10(=103) \text { c vahies (Lat. a } \beta)
\end{array}
$$

[^18]B. On tiles of which there is only a single specimen.
$$
11(=147) \quad \text { v vaaviis }
$$

In the Naples Museum, seen by me March 1894; Zvet. Osc. xvii. 7; the letters are over an inch (.030 m.) high, a a is FH instead of the usual N. Dressel gives $W$ but reads it aa. There seems to be an interpunct after the first $\mathbf{V}$.

$$
12(=153) \text { kì pa tir půl.. | vs.. }
$$

Written with a stilus, not stamped: the first letter might be $\mathbf{d}$, the interpunct before $t$ was certain, and not more than two letters wanting at the end of the line. 1.2 Before what Dressel took for $\mathbf{V}$ there was no letter, only an injury to the stone; hence de Petra's and Corssen's restoration ki patir pi [mpaiians] $\stackrel{\circ}{u} p s[e d$ is very doubtful.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 13(=148) \quad \text { gn hegi... } \quad 14(=141) \quad \text { ge asilli } \\
& 15(=142) \text { g.a } \quad 16(=149) \quad \mathrm{V} \text { ist } \\
& 17(=154) \text { ni pupie Mau Pomp. Beitr. } 186 \text { reads půp- } \\
& 18(=162) \text {...pask pak } \quad 19(=151) \text { můi }(m=N) \\
& 20(=161) \text {...rar.. } 21(=163) \text {...ki̊s } \\
& 22 \text { ( }=165 \text { ) } 111 \text { possibly Lat. PPH } \\
& 23 \text { (=144) B above } A \text { (a dolphin between them) : more Latin than Oscan. } \\
& 24(=140) \text { a } \\
& 25(=143) \mathrm{bn} ? \quad \mathbf{n}=\mathrm{N} \text { with the left-hand upper corner broken, pos- } \\
& \text { sibly Osc. } \boldsymbol{N} \text {. }
\end{aligned}
$$

> C. On tiles which are now lost.

$$
26(=152) \quad \underset{\sim}{m} \mathrm{p} \quad 27(=160) \quad \text { vio tre (once read iů tre) }
$$

Note viii. In addition to these Corss. Eph. Ep. II. p. 179, Fabr. Suppl. 1. 502 give dek te... on a tile which was lost but had been copied by E. Brizi. Is it anything more than a misreading of 3 or 4 supra?

Corssen (ibid. p. 180-1) gives also two inscc. stamped on earthenware dolia, which are now lost, from copies by Schöne.

## a. un nüv

These letters are followed by $\mathbf{u i}$, which are rather taller and possibly are only the number vi written in the Osc. order, for which cf. Note xxi. p. 217 infr . For nos. on dolia of. C. I. L. Iv. p. 171. Zvet. Osc. 115, Fabr. 2723 b.
b. step kai? Zvet. Osc. 116. Fabr. 2819 e.

78-86 Inscriptions scratched with a stilus (graffiti).
78 In the atrium of reg. 9, ins. 1, no. 22; Zvet. Osc. xvii. 13, where an is added at the end which Nissen (C. I. L. rv. 2395) omits. I could not find the insc. in March 1894.

## sabinis

Letters 1 in . (.024 m.) high, $\mathbf{a}=\square$; according to the faosim. there is a stroke through the last $i$ rather above the middle (which is probably accidental, not the thorn of $\dot{\mathbf{i}}$, as it is too long, too high up, and begins on the left of the vertical). Nissen gives the first g as $\Sigma$.

Zvet. Osc. 117, Fabr. 2822.

79 On the W. wall of the Casa del Fauno, now not visible (r. 6, ins. 12), Zvet. Osc. xvii. 14.
...nis puf..
Letters 4 in . high ( 10 m .) very rough ; a space but no interpunct after n is. For the date of the inscc. on this house see the note to supra. Zvet. Osc. 118.

80 On the E. wall of the same house, Zvet. Osc. xvii. 16, but the plaster has now fallon away all along this wall.

## pis pis?

Letters $\frac{1}{2}$ in. (. 012 m .) high; the last $S$ is a Greek $₹$ with the upper half rounded, the first the Osc. 子. On the right is $R R$ which cannot be Oscan. Zvet. Osc. 120.

On the same wall was a monogram $\square$ which, if it be Oscan ( $\mathbf{p a}$ ?), is miswritten for $N$. id. ib. 119, tab, xvii. 15.
(1) Fragments of Oscan alphabets on the same walls, now fallen away completely. Zvet. Osc. xvii. 17-24, Mau, Bull. Ins. Arch. Rom. 1875 p. 60, Fiorelli Mon. Ep. Pomp. x. 9-12.

On the $E$. wall outside.
 $f$ i u

The whole a $\alpha$ proceeds from left to right, but each of the first four letters was turned towards the left ( $\nabla g>$, and also teste $Z v e t$. $\square$ and $\rangle$ ), the rest faced towards the right; the writer must have been used to the Latin aß. Mau saw also $\mid$ and $K$ but made nothing of the following letters except 1 (which was $\mid \cdot$ ) and ․․ Zvet. found the rest 'satis clarae' in Oct. 1875. I was $\odot$.
b. n b . | d e..| h.k....|n p...| $u f \underline{i}$.

All these letters (and their direction as a whole) were from left to right, except $N$ (no doubt because it does not resemble Lat. $A$ ) and $M$ (no doubt kept by $M_{1}$ which would be uninfluenced by Lat. M). Mau saw $\mathbf{i}$ after $\mathbf{h}$ and a broken $\mathbf{u}$ at the end.

On the W. wall outside.
c. a b g d e
e. $\quad \mathrm{a} \quad \mathrm{b} \quad \mathrm{g}$ d
d. a b b g d
f. a b g d

In $(d)$ and $(f) \mathrm{g}$ was rounded; in $(d) \underline{d}$ was $\gg$; these were all retrograde.
On a tufa pillar on the other side of the street were scratched the letters n and p. Zvet. Osc. 132.

82 Etiamnunc in pariete lupanaris; C. I. L. Iv. tab: xvii. 6, unde Zvet. Osc. xvii. 32.

## markas

Zvet. Osc. 130, Fabr. 2821.

## 83-86 Doubtful graffiti.

83 On the outside wall of the casa del poeta tragico in the vico d. Fullonica. Fior. Mon. Ep. Pomp. x. 4, Momm. U. D. p. 188. Still quite clear.

## g ivdailehsii

Large letters, absurdly irregular ; $\boldsymbol{h}$ is generally read $\mathbf{0}$ but it has a (possibly accidental) dot near the middle. They are followed by hsoieiiriio (with an ordinary h), which Mommsen calls 'müssige Striche,' a description which it is difficult not to apply to the whole insc., at least if it is regarded as anything but a badly needed exercise in writing. $\mathbf{a}$ is $E \mid$ and the two $i$ and the last two i have a short stroke to the right at top and bottom $\mathrm{E}[. \quad$ U.D. 1. c. Zvet. Osc. 122, Fabr. 2807.

84 On the outer wall of the casa del Fauno, no longer visible. Fior. Mon. Ep. Pomp. x. 5, U. D. p. 188, Zvet. Osc. xvii. 26.

## di u pibisus?

The letters vary from $1 \frac{1}{3} \mathrm{in}$. to $\frac{1}{2} \mathrm{in}$. ( 0037 to 012 m .) in height, indeed the first two letters, which are the largest, do not seem to have been written at the same time as the rest ; the first $\mathfrak{u}$ may be $X$; the sign before the second $\boldsymbol{u}$ is $n$ bad $\mathbf{i}$ or a bad $\mathbf{s}$; only the lower angle of this $\mathbf{u}$ is left. The gaps in the text indicate spaces, not interpuncts, on the original. For the date of this and the following inse. see the note to es supra. Zvet. Osc. 213, Fabr. 2808.

85 In the same place-formerly; the same authorities.

## p kuiirinis

Not quite so doubtful as the last, the letters $\frac{1}{4} \mathrm{in}$. (.006 m.) high: $\mathfrak{u}$ is $\mathrm{Y}, \mathrm{i}$ may be merely a dent in the plaster made earlier than the insc., has an inclined vertical with its thorn on the left and is very much like $u$. Zvet. Osc. 124, Fabr. 2809.

86 On the base of some statue in front of one of the pillars of the South portico of the Temple of Apollo, scratched with a blunt tool in the rough plaster which
was meant to be covered with stucco; in April 1894 it was still legible, and the last $\mathbf{m}$ almost as clear as the rest, I thought, though Mau omits it.

## $1 \mathrm{mumm} . .$.

Mau (Pompeianische Beitrïge p. 96) dates the insc. with the temple at about 78 в.c. Zvet. Inscc. It. Inf. Dial. 156 b.

Note ix. The following are very doubtful graffiti: of the last four even the locality is unknown.
a. On the inner wall of the atrium of the casa del Centenario; M a $u$, Bull. Inst. Arch. Rom. 1881 p. 126 (ef. p. 122), less fully Not. Scav. 1879 p. 282. It was scratched in plaster which fell to pieces almost as soon as it was exposed, so that the reading cannot be verified.

## nevpůs ieri |sal?

The letters in Mau's sketch are pure Osc., but the first word sounds very doubtful. The insc. must be later than 15 A.D. as the wall over which the plaster was put bears a Lat. insc. of that date. Deecke gave an Etruscan interpretation in the Wochenschr. Klass. Phil. 1887 p. 132. Zvet. Inscc. It. Inf. D. 156 c.
b. In the vico d. Fauno. Fior. Mon. Ep. Pomp. x 7; Garrucci Inscc. !rravées au trait sur les murs de Pompéi (Brussels, 1854), p. 54 read it otherwise.
p..a.ries?

Before p, at about one letter's distance, is an twice as large as the other letters. Zvet. Osc. 125, Fabr. 2810.
c. Fior. l. c. $\times 13$ (e), Garr. l.c.

## ni pinni?

The first $\mathbf{n}$ is $Y$, the first I has a thorn, slanting downwards, on the left hence Fior. thought it an i̊ turued round. Zvet. Osc. 126, Fabr. 2812.
$d-f$. Garrucci l. $c$.
d. abuk..dn?

Zv. 127, Fabr. 2813.
e. gusmus??

Zv. 128, Fabr. 2811.

## f. $\mathrm{pd} \infty \infty$

Zv. 129, Fabr. 2820.
Remart. A Latin insc. on a basin of terra-cotta, part of a handmill, given in Notiz. Scav. 1882 p. 83, is written in Lat. aß, but in the retrograde Osc. order: C. Petron. Saturnin.

## 87 Inscription of Herculaneum.

Strabo (5.4.8) tells us that Herculaneum went through the same changes of population as Pompeii: Oscans, Etruscans, Samnites; but its remains seem to show no trace of Greek colonisation (Beloch, Camp. p. 218). We have seen (p. 51) that the town belonged to the Nucerine League, and with the other members it entered the Roman alliance in 307 b.c., and remained faithful to Rome until the invasion of Papius Mutilus in the first year of the Social War, when the Italian party in the town handed it over to him: it was however re-taken by Sulla's legate in the following year (Vell. Pat. 2. 16), and became a municipium. Like Pompeii, the town suffered from the eartbquake of 63 A.D., and was overwhelmed by the eruption of Vesuvius in 79. Later eruptions have covered it still more deeply. The oldest Latin inscc. belong to the first century of the Empire, and I see no reason to doubt that Oscan was still spoken in the town in the last century B.C.

The first excavations on the site were made in 1709 and lasted till 1716, being resumed from 1827 to 1837, and from 1869 to 1875. Since the modern village of Resina largely covers the site, we can hardly hope to see the town as a whole ever uncovered, especially as it lies at so much greater depth, and beneath more hardened ash-tufa than Pompeii ; but this latter circumstance makes it probable that, when the excavations are continued, their fruits will be all the richer for having been well protected.

A marble table for offerings found in Herculaneum in 1739, probably in the Theatre with a bronze statue of Hercules, and perhaps a small marble Venus, standing on a bearded Priapus which is known to have been there. The table is now in the Naples Museum, where I saw it March 1894; facsim. Momm. U. D. x 18, Zvet. Osc. x 4.

## a. herentateis sům.

## b. I slaabiis 1 auki̊l meddiss ti̊tiks herentatei herukinai průffed.

$(a)$ is in the middle of the flat surface of the table, which is surrounded by a raised moulding and measures 49 in . by $25 \frac{1}{2}$ ( 1.23 by 64 m .), (b) along an outside edge, which it comfortably fills beneath the moulding: a
channel is cut in one corner through the moulding to allow water or blood to run off.

The letters of ( $a$ ) are $1 \frac{1}{2}$, of (b) 1 in . high (. 035 and .025 m .), both finely cut in Osc. aß. As in the insec. of the best period, the middle bar of e is shorter than the others. The reading is clear except that the punct of $\mathfrak{\mathfrak { U }}$ in $(\alpha)$ is almost worn away. U. D. p. 179, Zvet. Osc. 60, Fabr. 2784.

Note x. Three letters stamped on lamp found at Herculaneum; Antichità di Ercolano, Naples 1792, viii, p. 183.

## x

The letters and the (single) interpuncts seem clear in the facsimile; their first editor read them as Latin, z.v. x., Fabretti $(2784,2)$ took the last two signs as Oscan, but it is conceivable that they are Greek marks of value or capacity, cf. Kretschmer, Gr. Vaseninschrr. p. 2 and Note xiv. p. 138 inf. Zvet. Osc. 61.

## 2. Inscriptions of Cumae (88-92).

Chalcidian Cumae ${ }^{1}$, the oldest (by tradition) of all Greek colonies in the West, the mother city ${ }^{2}$ of Naples, and the source of the art of writing for nearly the whole of Italy, appears in early records as the bulwark of Hellenism amid the competing tribes of the peninsula. In 524 B.C. (Dion. Hal. 7. 2) the men of Cumae under Aristodemos won a great victory over the Etruscans of Capua, the Daunii of Nola and the Ausones of Mt Massicus; fifty years later we find the town allied with Hiero in his great naval victory over the Etruscans. But the prosperity and refinement which are attested for us by a beautiful series of coins ${ }^{3}$ were overwhelmed by the Samnite invasion in the last quarter of the fifth century ${ }^{4}$, though the buildings of the town and such of the population as

[^19]were suffered to survive exercised a strong Greek influence on their rude captors, traces of which were still to be observed even after, and long after, the town had again changed its language (Stra. 5. 4. 3). To this no doubt we should attribute the appearance of purely sepulchral inscc. at Cumae alone of Campanian towns (save perhaps Surrentum, p. 53 and cf. 22); and the dominance of Greek in the neighbourhood is illustrated by the insc. of Lacco (C. I. G. 5861, Kaibel 894), set upon a fortress in Aenaria by Campanian (i.e. Samnite) soldiers or condottieri some time between 474 and 326 B.C. ${ }^{1}$ It runs:
 каì oi $\sigma \tau \rho a \tau \iota \omega ิ \tau a l$. As Mommsen points out, the alphabet is partly cursive ${ }^{2}$, the Greek barbarous ( ${ }^{\prime} \rho \xi a \nu \tau \epsilon s$ for ${ }^{\prime} \rho \chi \neq \nu \tau \epsilon \varsigma^{3}$, à $\nu \dot{e} \theta \eta \kappa a \nu$ for à áé $\sigma \tau \eta \sigma a \nu$ ), and the names clearly Oscan.

In 338 b.c. (Liv. 8. 14) Cumae passed into the Roman alliance and received the civitas sine suffragio ${ }^{4}$. In the Hannibalic war it remained faithful to Rome, though besieged and ravaged (Liv. 23. 35 ff , 24. 13). But the change that in the end converted it from a busy port to a country resort noted for its quietness (e.g. Juvenal III. init.) began in 184 b.c. (C. I. L. x. 1781), when the Latin colony of Puteoli was founded, which at once became the emporium of the Campanian plain. We may perhaps connect with this the quaint but no doubt necessary request of the Cumaeans in 180 B.c. to be allowed to use Latin for public purposes (Liv. 40.42). This incident, if it does not imply the practical disappearance of Oscan from the town, cannot have long preceded it, and we can hardly suppose that the few insce. that follow are much, if at all, later than this date, though they are of a private character. Cumae received

[^20]full Roman citizenship in the Social War, and became a colony some time under Augustus or later ${ }^{1}$. Its few Latin inscc. begin from the times of Augustus.

The ancient burial ground lay to the N. of the town, in the modern Licola; the Samnite graves are about 15 feet beneath the Roman (Beloch, Camp. ${ }^{2}$ p. 167).

88 On a tufa stele found in June 1885 near Licola in the necropolis of Cumae, now in the Naples Museum. A rough facsimile was given by Sogliano in Notiz. Scav. 1885, p. 322 (reproduced by Zvet. Insc. It. Inf. Dial., p. 170). The present text is from a paper-impression sent me by the former, which I compared with the original in March 1894.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text {.....il......|.ss tint a.. | } \\
& \text {..d ana..s ..|re tůmaf st| } \\
& \text { ist }
\end{aligned}
$$

The stele is 43 in . high, 16 broad and 15 thick ( 1.075 by 40 by 37 m .); the insc. runs across the face at the top, covering about 10 in . ( 25 m .) of the length; beneath it are two emblems side by side, on the left a long leaf-shaped fan, on the right a pointed porch or frame containing a circle over a pear-shaped loop, no doubt a mirror with a clumsy handle, as Sogliano suggests: the whole is clearly one of the class of iuvilas or dedicated coats of arms, see p. 101 ff . inf.

The letters are from 2 to $1 \frac{1}{2} \mathrm{in}$. ( 04 m .) high, deeply cut from right to left in late Osc. $a \beta$ (with $N, N V$ for $H, H-1$ ); the interpunct is generally near the top of the line (and hence once or twice omitted in Sogliano's transcript). 1.1 after a space of three letters shows a possible trace of the lower half of $\stackrel{\mathfrak{U}}{ }$, then $\square$, probably the lower half of either $\mathbf{v}, \mathrm{h}$, or $\mathbf{e}$, $\mathbf{V}$ being perhaps the most likely; $\downarrow$ - is fairly clear, then apparently an interpunct followed by the lower half of $a, e, v$, or $p$, then illegible strokes (room for five or six letters). 2. SS is clear, and before $t$ a punct. Sogliano read another after $\mathbf{n}$, where however there is a large breakage in the stone, but the punct between $t$ and $\mathbf{a}$ is quite clear; then possibly $>$ or $\lambda$ (or $>$. or $\psi$ ). 3. I can make out nothing before $d$ except an apparent interpunct between two verticals (not $\mathbf{i}$ ) ; after $\boldsymbol{d}$ the punct
${ }^{1}$ Beloch, Camp. ${ }^{2}$ p. 450 , against Mom. C. I. L. x. p. 351 , who refers the colony to Augustus.
and ana are certain, and then what looks like either III or $\underline{i m}$, which I take for lii ; then $\mathbf{S}$ is certain, after it a punct followed by the lower half of m .

All the letters of 11. 4, 5 with interpuncts at e and f are certain: a punct at the end of 4 is probably accidental.

The whole might be restored in some such way as the following: [ek. $i] u ̈[v] i l .$, , [pam sakvi]ss Tint. A... D. Analiis M. retimaf., st. ist. The gens Annalia occurs in Picenum ( 374 inf . B). For sakriss the name of a festival or gentile assembly like pimperiais would be better, but it must be short and in the 3rd declension, or else contain -ss- in the body of the word, which would then be here abbreviated. For the double name of the family cf. Tirentium Magiium 101 inf., for retiumaf see the Glossary, and for such abbreviations as retimaf(ed), st(aflatiu) *st(atiti) or st(aief), cf. 106-7 etc. They were especially necessary here because the space left by the carver for the engraver was very limited; indeed the wedge-like summits of the emblems run up through three lines of the text.

89, 90 Fragments of two other tufa stelae found near Cumae in 1853, now in the Naples Museum, where I saw them in March 1894; facsim. Zvet. Osc. viii. 1 and 2.

## 89 g silli $\mathrm{g} \quad 90$ statie | silie s | salavs

89 is a plain block 10 in . high by 18 broad ( 24 by 48 m .), with huge letters ( $5 \mathrm{in} .=125 \mathrm{~m}$. high) and single interpuncts.

90 is a larger slab ( 28 in . by $21=69$ by 52 m .) cut in the shape of a temple porch (cf. no. 22) with the inscr. between the pillars and (apparently) a head or some heraldic device in a shallow arch above, as in C. I. L. x. 4165. The letters are only $2 \frac{1}{4} \mathrm{in}$. ( 055 m .) high and more regular than in 89 . There is an interpunct and a whole letter's space before $\mathbf{S}$ in 1. 2; does that letter belong to statie or to silie, or to both, or to neither? For the first alternative cf. 106-7inf. Corssen (Ephem. Epigr. II. p. 164) regarded both inscc. as sepulchral.

Zvet. Osc. 52-3, Fabr. 2760-1.

91 Round the side of a handsome two-handled goblet of black clay, 7 in . high by 10 broad ( 17 by $\cdot 25 \mathrm{~m}$.), found in a grave at Cumae in 1853, and now in the Ermitage-Museum at St Petersburg : facsim. Zvet. Osc. viii. 3.

## upils ufiis

The letters, once gilt, are of somewhat primitive type, e.g. 1 is $V, \mathbf{p}$ is $\Pi, \mathrm{s} Z$; there is one interpunct between the names, but three in a vertical line after the second, to distinguish the end from the beginning on the circular ground.

Zvet. Osc. 54, Fabr. 2762.
[2 Scratched on a slab of terra-cotta 12 in . by 9 ( 30 by $\cdot 22 \mathrm{~m}$.) found, according to Garrucci (Tegolo Cumano, Naples, 1862) in a field near the Arco Felice at Cumae, but now lost; from him Zvet. Osc. viii. 4.

## ůpsim?

Written twice, once on either wing of a cloak stretched out at arm's length on both sides by a woman's figure standing on a flattened sphere partly merged in the ground-line; the whole delicately drawn with a stilus. On the cloak are ten stars, and the figure seems to me to symbolise the evening, cf. Verg. Aen. 8. 369 Nox ruit et fuscis tellurem amplectitur alis. It is a great pity the original is lost ; without it one can scarcely regard the text as a certainty. For a suggestion as to the meaning see Class. Rev. vil. p. 464 footn. 5.

Zvet. Osc. 55, Fabr. 2763 bis.

## 3. Inscriptions of Nola and Abella (93-96).

The oldest inhabitants of Nola of whom we have knowledge were the Ausones (Hekat. ap. Steph. Byz.) and they were subdued sometime in the vI or $\mathrm{V}^{1}$ century B.c. by the Etruscans, after the foundation of Capua (Cato ap. Vell. 1. 7). The Etruscan settlement is attested by numerous inscc. of a later date, see p. 94, and Note xi., and no doubt contributed to the early development of civilisation in the town, especially perhaps by fostering its intercourse with the Greeks of Naples. About the end of the vth century b.c. Nola fell into the hands of the Samnites, but it still maintained a close connexion with the Neapolitans, so that various writers (e.g. Sil. Ital. 12. 161) call Nola also 'Chalcidian.' Hence too came the Greek legends of its coins ( $340-268$ B.c., Head p. 34) , and the wealth of Greek, especially Athenian, vases that have passed from the tombs of Nola to all the collections of Europe. The local manufacture

[^21]also is famous, especially for the fineness of its black enamel. Some part of this work would seem to have been conducted by Etruscans who survived the Samnite invasion, see p. 94 inf .

Nola first appears in Roman annals in 328 b.c., when it took part against Rome in the quarrel that kindled the great Samnite war (Liv. 8. 23, Dion. Hal. 15. 5). It was conquered by the Romans in 313 (Liv. 9. 28) and admitted to their alliance on favourable terms (Liv. 23. 44, cf. Head p. 34). When Hannibal lay in Campania after the battle of Cannae we find a popular movement against Rome thwarted by the nobles and sternly punished by Marcellus, who threw himself into the town, beheaded seventy leading democrats and re-adjusted the constitution in the interest of the senate (Liv. 23.17). In the first year of the Social War Nola was taken by Papius Mutilus, and remained the hottest centre of the contest till 80 B.C., when it was taken by Sulla after the garrison had set fire to the town and fled, Mutilus himself falling in the rout (e.g. App. B.C.1. 42, 50,65 , Plut. Sulla 8). In 73 the town was plundered by Spartacus (Florus 2. 8.5), and the silence of subsequent writers (especially Cicero, de Leg. Agr. 2. $\S \S 86,96$ ) shows that it never regained its prosperity. It was colonised probably by Sulla (C. I. L. x. 1244, col. Felix Augusta and cf. Beloch Camp. ${ }^{2}$ p. 448) certainly by Augustus, who died there. There are no Latin inscc. earlier than the death of Julius.

In the Oscan inscc. we find here, and here only, a meddis deketasis (94, 95, but two in 93) who is on a level with the quaestor of Abella (95), and a senate. It is perhaps due to the Marcellan constitution as much as to the religious and fiscal character of the Agreement with Abella (95), that there is no mention in it of a popular assembly.

A bella no doubt shared many of the fortunes, as well as the fabulous Greek origin (schol. ad Aen. 7. 740), of its more powerful neighbour. We find it possessed of a quaestor and a senate; its priority of mention to Nola in the Agreement may perhaps be explained by supposing that the Abellans had a stronger traditional claim to the temple of Hercules. In the Social War the town was faithful to Rome, and it seems to have been colonised by (Sulla or) Augustus (Beloch Camp. ${ }^{2}$ p. 448), in whose time the Latin insce. begin.

93 Found in the Vivenzi gardens at Nola in 1792, according to Guarini under the ruins of an ancient temple; now in the Naples Museum, where I saw it in March 1894 ; facsim. Zvet. Osc. x. 1.

# n]ium[s]is heirennis niumsieis ka | perkens gaaviis perkedne[is].. | meddiss degetasiůs araget[ud 

On a block of hard travertine 32 by $7 \frac{1}{2} \mathrm{in}$. ( 80 by $\cdot 19 \mathrm{~m}$.), which seems to have lost nothing on the right save the top corner with the beginning of 1. 1 , but, to judge by the absence of a cognomen in 1.2 , more than two letters' space has gone on the left ; and if the insc. contained any verb or an epithet to $\operatorname{araget}[u d]$ another line or lines must have gone at the bottom. The letters are $1 \frac{1}{2} \mathrm{in}$. ( 04 m .) high, once coloured red, not very regularly cut, and without the embellishments of 95 . They have on the whole a curious look; $\mathbf{r}$ is $\nabla$ though the cross-strokes are generally horizontal; the arms of $\mathbf{e}$ are equal and all unusually short ; the top and bottom bars of $\mathbf{S}$ are nearly horizontal ; $i$ in 1.1 is twice $上$ though in 1.3 we have the regular + ; the first $i$ of niumsieis is $\lambda$ and the first $p$ of 1.2 has a crossstroke $(\bar{N})$. 1.1 Interpunct before $\mathbf{k a}$ uncertain. 3 Punct of $\mathbf{u}$ uncertain, only the top half of get remains.

The Oscan seems, on the whole, too good for a forger, but the peculiarities of the writing incline me to think that the stone is, at best, a good transcript from some ms. copy of the real insc.
U. D. p. 178 , Zvet. Osc. 57, Fabr. 2769.

94 On a rectangular block of stone 32 in . long, 27 wide and 11 high ( 791 by $\cdot 659$ by $\cdot 264 \mathrm{~m}$.), found in Nola and once kept in the Episcopal Seminary there but now lost. The text depends on the copy by Remondini (Dissertazioni, Genoa 1760, p. 51 and 53 , with a sketch $a d$ fin., seen by me in the Naples Library, April 1894) which is given by Momm. U. D. viii. 16 whence Zvet. Osc. x. 2.

## paakul mulukiis marai meddis

 degetasis aragetud multas[ikud?The upper surface of the stone was cut smooth, the lower side left rough, whence Momm . concludes it was an altar; the insc. was on one of the narrower sides. Little can be inferred from the copy as to the character of the writing except that it was in full Osc. $\alpha \beta$
(Remondini may have written $\mathbf{u}$ for $\stackrel{\circ}{\mathbf{~}}$ in multas) with single interpuncts (in 1. 1, but none in 1.2 in the copy), and possibly with angular $\triangleleft$. To judge from 1.1 nothing is lost at the end of the lines. 1. 1 marai is no doubt an abbreviation for maraieis. 2 the termination -ikud may have been omitted on the original.

What is the (chronological or other) relation between the single magistrate of this insc. and the two of the preceding?
U. D. p. 178, Zvet. Osc. 58, Fabr. 2768.

## 95 Cippus Abellanus.

Found by Remondini in Avella in 1745 in use as a doorstep, the tradition then being that sixty years earlier it had been fetched from Castel d' Avella (Avella Vecchia), which is a mile from Avella on the road which Kiepert marks as the probably ancient road to Nola. Thanks to Remondini's efforts it was at last transferred in 1750 to the Episcopal Seminary at Nola, where I saw it in April 1894. The text owes most to Remondini, Lepsius, and Mommsen; with the latter Zvetaieff (Osc.ix.) agrees in almost every point; the text below is from his facsimile, compared by me with the original ${ }^{1}$. The restorations are accepted by Bücheler (Commentationes in honorem Th. Mommseni, Berlin 1877, p. 227 ff .) except where it is otherwise stated.

The insc. is written on two sides ( $a$ and $b$ ) of a block of hard limestone from the Abellan hills, about 6 ft .5 in . ( 1.92 m .) high, 1 ft .8 in . ( 0.51 m .) broad ${ }^{2}$ and 11 in . ( 0.27 m .) thick. The lower lines of the front are damaged. The letters are well engraved, in the latest Osc. $a \beta$, about $1 \frac{1}{2} \mathrm{in}$. ( 038 m .) high, not deeply cut, but finished with a good deal of care, all straight strokes being broadened at their extremities (I, V, instead of I, V); the single interpunct is only once missing ( 67 ), and the beginning of a new sentence is marked, by a slightly increased space between the words ( $a 10,23, b 11,15,17,22,28$ ). The division

[^22]of a word at the end of a line is generally avoided, but becomes more frequent in (b), as do the ligatures, clearly because the engraver was cramped by having to leave a certain space blank at the foot of the stone (about $\frac{1}{7}$ of its height). We may reasonably infer that the stone was to stand in the ground, probably opposite the temple to which the insc. relates ${ }^{1}$.

The Cippus is among the most important monuments of Oscan that we possess, from its good preservation, its wealth of grammatical forms, its careful spelling (the only variation is in the use of doubled vowels, slaagid, slagim), and the almost complete certainty with which it is now interpreted. It contains an agreement between the towns of Abella and Nola as to the use of a temple of Hercules (Osc. Hereclo-) which lay upon, or more strictly between, their borders ${ }^{2}$. Mommsen pointed out that the functions of the Senate of Nola which appear in $a 8$, b 9 are probably later than 216 b.c., when Marcellus increased its powers (Liv. 23. 17), while on the other hand such an agreement cannot have been made by the Nolans after their terrible sufferings in the Social War, when the 'treasury' must have been 'opened' once for all. It seems probable, indeed, that Oscan then ceased to be spoken in the town. Double consonants and vowels appear in Lat. inscc. about 133 b.C., and the elaboration of the alphabet in this insc. places it on a level with the latest public Oscan inscc. of Pompeii. I doubt if it is older than 150 B.C. at the earliest.

[^23](a) maiiůi vestirikiㅇํㅇ mai sir | prupukid sverrunei kvaistulrei abellanůi inim maiiư ${ }^{\text {in }}$ | iův5 kiiui mai pukalatuii | medikei deketasiůi nův$1[a \mid n u ̊ i]$ inim ligatiois abell[anuis | inim ligatuiis nůvlanůis | půs senateis tanginůd suveis půtůrůs10, 11 pid ligat[ůs | fufans ekss kůmbened. | sakaraklům herekleis | slaagid pů ist inim teer[ům | půd ůp eisůd sakaraklůd [ist | půd anter teremniss eh... 15, 16 ist pai teremenniů mů[inikad | tanginůd průftůset r[ehtůd | amnůd puz idik sakaralklům | inim idik terům můinik[ů | můinikei terei fusid [inim 20, 21 eissis sakarakleis i[nim | tereis fruktatiuf fr[ukta -
 $24,25,26$.......herekleis fiṇ s ... | ...iispid nůvlan… ...pam..gta
$a 1$ One letter may have been effaced at the end of the line. Büch. prints sir.... 14 Momms. eh[trad]. Büch. supposes that the original was the Osc. equivalent of Lat. extentum, Bugge of Lat. exstat; Bartholomae would restore more simply eh[trů is 'externis.' The last sign is damaged and might be an e as well as an h . 16-20 In the middle of these lines there is a blemish in the stone which is clearly older than the inscr. 17 puz is quite clear, though the early editors read it puv. 24 Before herekleis there is a remnant of $t$. 26 begins with two verticals, then p with a superfluous cross stroke near its feet, then $p$ or a without diagonal, then perhaps $m$, though the first vertical is nearer the second than that is to the third. Then another vertical, then a letter's space, then yet another vertical and then the last three letters are quite clear. After this line are lost " at least five lines and at most ten, but probably containing only one sentence" (Büch.).
(b) ekkum [svai pid hereset triib barak[avů terei půd | liimitů. term....... | herekleis fiisnů 5, 6 mefi[ů | ist ehtrad feihu노s pů [s | herekleis fiinsnam amfret pert viam puisstist | pai ip ist půstin 9, 10 slagim | senateis suveis tangi|nůd tribarakavům likitud. inim iůk tribalrakkiuf pam nůvlanůs tribarakattuset inim | ůittiuf nůvlanům estud. | 15, 16 ekkum svai pid abellanů | tribarakattuset iůk trilbarakkiuf inim uiottiuf abellanům estud. avt 19,20 pist feihoiis půs fisnam ampret eisei terei nep abel lanůs nep nůvlanůs pidum | tribarakattins. avt the savrům půd esei terei ist pů patensins, 25 můinikad ta[nginůd patensins inim pid e[sei thesavrei půkkapid eh[stit|a]ittium alttram alt$\operatorname{tr}[$ us|h]errins. avt anter slagim | a]bellanam inim 30,31 nůvlanam | p]ůllad viů uruvů ist tedur | e]isai 32 viai mefiai teremen $n$ ]iu staiet.
b3 Bartholomae would restore liimitio [is s$]$ termn[ater, and after this a relative must be lost, probably (Biich.) in the dat. pl., referring to liimitů. and depending on mefi[ů]. 7 Stone amfretpert. $10 \underline{\underline{\mathfrak{u}}}$ of - avi̊um may have been $\mathbf{u}$. 13 There appears to have been an interpunct between tribarakat and tuset, and so, clearly in 1. 16, and 1. 22 tribarakat - tins. 24 Stone patensins: mỉinikad. 26 h has lost its left-hand stroke and might be e. 28 Huschke [f]errins. $\quad 30$ of the $\mathbf{r}$ in tedur I could only see $\downarrow$.

Bücheler Comm. Philol. in honorem Mommseni (Berlin 1877) p. 227. Bugge Kuhn's Zeitschr. v. (1856) p. 1, xxII. (1874) p. 442. Bartholomae Idg. Forsch. vi. 307. Momm. U. D. p. 121. Corssen K. Z. xiII. (1864) p. 191. Zvet. Osc. 56, Fabr. 2783.

96 On a stone found in Abella and taken to the Seminary at Nola, where it was lost ; first published by Passeri in 1752, by him again with a different reading in 1753, the second being given by Remondini (Dissertazioni, Genoa 1760, p. 51 and 53, which I saw in the Naples Library, April 1894) ; Remondini's own copy is given in the table at the end of the Dissertations. All three versions of the text appear to be corrupt ; they are given by Momm. U.D. p. 179.
mais vesi I main terem?

So Remondini, except trem for terem; the latter seems more likely. Passeri's two readings were mansiesim malketrem and mais vesi mape terem.
U. D. p. 179, Zvet. Osc. 59, Fabr. 2771.
4. Inscriptions on Etrusco-Campanian vases from Nola, Suessula, Capua (97-100, with Note xi.).

These vases are found in great numbers, with and without incised inscriptions, within a narrow geographical area indicated by the places mentioned above. They are of similar fabrique and the earliest of them are ascribed with confidence by archaeologists (von Duhn, Bull. Inst. Arch. Rom. 1879, p. 157 ff. and Mitth. deutsch. arch. Inst. II. p. 266) to the period $350-250$ B.c. But the inscriptions present considerable difficulties and hitherto there has been no general agreement among scholars as to the language in which they are written; the alphabet in all but the first is pure Etruscan, and even there the traces of a distinctively Oscan character are scanty. In 1850 Mommsen (U.D. p. 313 ff .), who had only some 18 examples to judge from, prudently treated them all as Etruscan, but others which have since been found seem to debar us from this simple solution. The whole of 97 and three words of 99 are indisputable Oscan, though the last two are something else.

98 varies from normal Oscan by a genitive in -es instead of -eis, but by that only (cf. also pauces 152). Others again, which I have collected in the Appendix (and cf. Note xviii.), seem quite as indisputably Etruscan-showing the Etr. \& ( $\bowtie$ ), a genitive in $-s a$, nominatives in $-a$ or $-e i$, the 'pronoun' mi 'hoc est' (according to Pauli Altital. Stud. III. p. 55) and combinations of vowels (e.g. eu) or consonants (e.g. -lpn-$-l \theta r-$ ) strange to Oscan. Yet others, which will be found in Note xi., cannot be assigned with certainty to either Oscan or Etruscan, though some appear to be on a level with 99. Despite therefore the objection of von Duhn (l.c.), who thought that an 'einheitliche Gruppe' of vases ought to show an equally ' einheitliche Sprache,' we are bound to accept Deecke's view (in Gröber's Grundr. d. romanischen Philol. 1. p. 346) of all but those which are pure Etruscan, namely that they are written in a mongrel dialect. And after all, what is more probable? The fact that most, if not all, of the inscc. are incised, i.e. scratched upon the vases when they were glazed, baked, and ready for sale, indicates that they were written either by or for the various purchasers, and in the latter case, who that has ever sent a foreign book to be bound will be in the least surprised that these would-be Oscan labels were misspelt and barbarously distorted by the workmen of an Etruscan factory? The mixed Etrusco-Latin of the familiar Praenestine vases is an exact parallel. See 286 ff . inf.; and compare Lattes' most useful collection, Iscriz. Paleolatine di provenienza Etrusca.

The name Suessula points to an Auruncan origin for the town, but these inscc. leave us in no doubt that the Etruscans settled in it, probably at the same time as in Nola and Capua. In this N.E. strip of the Campanian plain a considerable number of Etruscans must have maintained themselves and their language after the Samnite invasion (just as they did in Latium, p. 310 inf. .), till well within the historical period. In 338 B.C. (Liv. 8. 14) Suessula received the civitas sine suffragio, and through its position at the mouth of the Caudine Forks it played a leading part in the Samnite and Hannibalic wars (Liv. 7. 39, and lib. 23-5 passim). It probably was colonised by Sulla (C. I. L. x. p. 363), and except C. I. L. $\mathrm{I}^{1} 1504$ ( $=\mathrm{x} .3760$ ), a boundary column of the Gracchan triumvirs, there seem to be no Lat. inscc. of the republican period.

97 Found in 1886 in the necropolis of Suessula, and published by von Duhn from a traced copy by Baron Spinelli in Mittheil. d. deutschen arch. Inst. zu Rom ii. p. 266. Now in the Villa Spinelli at Cancello (Suessula), where I saw it April 1894.

## minis beriis anei upsatuh sent tiianei

Finely incised in letters $\frac{3}{8} \mathrm{in}$. ( 009 m .) high on the inside of a plate glazed black ('a vernice nera'), with handsome geometrical border and a man's head in the centre, found in a tomb of tufa full of Etrusco-Campanian vases and ornaments with incised designs "in the manner proper to the 3rd century b.c." (von D.). The interpunct is double and regular, and the a $\beta$ may be called Oscan with inclined cross-strokes, but it was probably cut by an engraver more familiar with other characters, as $Z$ tends to be rounded into $\mathcal{Z}, \mathrm{t}$ is both $\uparrow$ and $T$, and $\mathbf{r}$ has the curious shape $\mathcal{C}$, which Lattes (p. 97) reads as $l$.

98 Minervini, Bull. Arch. Nap. nuov. ser. vii. (1859) tav. 3, whence Fabretti 2782², Lattes p. 98.

## luvcies cnaiviies sum

On a patera a vernice nera in a tomb at Nola; in Etr. a $\beta$, interp. regular, but after the first B at the foot and superfluously inserted after cnai. c is $\rangle \mathrm{e} \lambda, \mathrm{v} \lambda$.

99 Found at Curti and first published by Minervini Bull. Arch. Nap. n. s. ii, (1854) p. 137 tav. vii. 4 and 5 ; it was last heard of in the possession of Cav. Bonichi at Rome in 1854.

## vinuchs veneliis aeraciam tetet venilei viniciiu

The words were in Etr. $\alpha \beta$ from left to right, without interpunct, round the inner margin of the mouth of a fine vase about 53 m . ( 21 in .) high, and the mouth about ' 26 m . broad. It had two handles, each with two large male heads in 'archaic style' (Minervini l.c. p. 137).

Garrucci wished to read aeraci sestam, but there is absolutely no gap in the facsimile given by Minervini.

Lattes Tscriz. Paleolat. p. 88, Fabr. 2753.

100 In Osc. a $\beta$ upside down on a rough unglazed but not unshapely flower-pot of terra-cotta, with a base, of quite different workmanship from the rest in this class : it came from Curti and I saw it in the collection of Sign. Bourguignon at Naples in April 1894.

## mame

Note xi. Oscan or E'truscan vase-inscc.?
1 Round the shoulder of a small broken vase found at Marcianise halfway between Capua and Suessula, and now in the Museo Campano where I saw it in April 1894. Published, not quite accurately, in Not. Scav. 1885, p. 322.
mirik . . uit.

The cross strokes of $m$ slope upward towards the right, and Deecke Wochenschr. class. Philol. 1887, p. 181 counts it rather Etruscan than Oscan.

2-6 On vases of various kinds now in the Berlin Antiquarium, transcribed by Mom. U.D. pp. 314-316, taf. xiii. 5, 8, 9. 2 comes from Naples, and is probably to be classed with the rest which are all of Nolan fabrique.

2 venileis
3 venlistita
4 veliiesnipe
5 herine

$$
6 \text { a up siie }
$$

The last four letters of 3 are $4, X \mid X$ and $M$. does not transcribe them; in 4 there is $\mathbb{E}$ space before the second $i$; in $6 a$ is $\mp$, and the second $i$ seems to have been made in two attempts, unless it is a very narrow $p$, with its second stroke running into the $e$.

3-6 cannot be Oscan unless they are abbreviated.
7-8 Incised on paterae in the collection of objects bought from Curti (Capua) belonging to Sign. Bourguignon, at Naples, where I saw them in April 1894. I do not know whether they have been published before.

7 mamurkes ar $\chi$ vanies

## 8 keis d iufahis

Both are in Etr. a $\alpha$ with single interpunct; in $7 \chi$ is $\psi, n H$, in 8 the $k$ may be ic, $h$ is $\rrbracket$, with its middle bar omitted, $f 8$.
C.

9 Incised on the inside of a flat vase with red patterns on a black ground in the Spinelli collection at Cancello (Suessula) where I saw it in April 1894.
cnai vecaisies alpnupuz nu
In Etr. $a \beta$ with slanting cross-bars, but with the Osc. $H=n$. The interpunct is single, and there may be one after vecai.

I do not know whether it has been published before.
10 U.D. p. 314, xiii. 3 from Lanzi tav. iii.; the provenance is not stated. Lattes l.c. p. 98, Fabr. 2837.

> veltineisim

11-13 U.D. p. 314-5 from Lepsius tab. xxvi.; 11 and 12 were found at S. Agata dei Goti (Nola) and are given by Lattes p. 98, Fabr. 2781, 2882; 13 is in the Naples Museum. 12 (i) and (ii) are on different parts of the vase, $a$ and vue are opposite one another on the edge of the circular bottom.

## 11 kanutiessim

12 (i) vipleisveliteisculchnasim
(ii) a vue

## 13 marahieispuntaisa

In 12 I have given the reading which seems to me with Lattes and von Planta (Osk. Umb. Gram. p. 126) the most likely, Mom. read enteis venteis. The last sign of 13 is $\Pi$ which Mom. reads as $p$ though the $p$ of puntais is $\Pi$. If I am right in reading it as $a$ with the cross-bar left out as it is in some of the Etrusc. insce. of the group the word is certainly not Oscan. But the $m$ is in the Oscan form H .

Von Planta (l.c.) would recognise the form sim as Oscan, but his explanation is doubtful. In any case culchna is not Oscan. It is greatly to be regretted that the originals of these three sim-inscc. have disappeared so that it is impossible to test the accuracy of the text.
5. Inscriptions of Capua (S. M. di Capua Vetere) (101-134).

Capua, the second city in Italy and in antiquity reputed a second Rome, was founded according to the best tradition (Cato ap. Voll. 1. 7) by Etruscans, though it is probable that a community of the Oscan or Ausonian stock ${ }^{1}$ was on the soil before them. At all events the city was completely under Etruscan rule when its authentic history begins in the vth century B.C. Strabo (5.4.3) tells us it was the head of the Etruscan towns of Campania. But after the great naval victory of Hiero at Cumae in 474 B.c., free communication between the lords of Campania and their kinsmen north of Latium was at an end, and they were left single-handed to cope with the invading Samnites from the hills, to whom the cities of the plain offered a tempting prize. In 435 b.c. (Diod. Sic. 12. 31) ${ }^{2}$ the Samnites took Capua, and having delivered their Oscan kinsmen from alien rule, were very quickly fused with them into a new population, which, though of purer Italic blood, was probably still impregnated with Etruscan beliefs and customs. Tradition says (Liv. 4. 37, Serv. ad Aen. 10.145) that the name of the city, hitherto Volturnum, was now changed to Capua.

Just a century later we find the townsmen driven into the Roman alliance for protection from the incursions of fresh swarms of their rude kindred from the hills. In 338 b.c. (Liv. 8. 14) the Campani ${ }^{3}$ became cives sine suffragio of Rome, this being the highest degree of privilege that could be granted to a non-Latin speaking ally ${ }^{4}$; the Romans acquired in return

[^24]the ager Falernus and Stellas, which had been the town lands. Twenty years later ${ }^{1}$ their laws are revised by the Roman praetor, and the praefecti Capuam Cumas appointed to exercise jurisdiction in these new burgess communities. But the town was still governed by its own magistrates for all other purposes, including the coinage (see 148 inf.), and still retained a certain headship over the neighbouring townships of Atella, Calatia and 'Velecha-' (147, 151). In the great Samnite war (314 B.C.), after the Roman defeat at Lautulae, the anti-Roman party in Capua roused a short-lived revolt (Liv. 9. 26, better Diod. 19. 76), but else we hear of no breach of the alliance until the Roman disasters in the first years of the Hannibalic war. The moving story of the next six years (216-211, Liv. 23-26 passim) is too well-known to be repeated here. Beloch (l.c. p. 305) suggests that Hannibal's apparent supineness in suffering the town to be shut in by the Roman lines was really a willingness to be rid of too powerful an ally; the Romans at all events used their hard-won victory to rid themselves for ever of a dreaded rival. The town was completely abolished, and its inhabitants driven out and dismissed to find refuge in various parts of Italy, save a few who were permitted to settle (as tenants of Rome) N. of the Volturnus. The whole territory of the city became Roman domain (ager Campanus), inhabited by state-tenants who were not allowed to form more than a loose village organisation. See e.g. the emphatic description of Cicero (Leg. Agr. 2 §88); statuerunt (maiores) si agrum Campanis ademissent, magistratus, senatum, publicum ex illa urbe consilium sustulissent, imaginem reipublicae nullam reliquissent, nihil fore quod Capuam timeremus. Other references and a summary of the inscriptional record will be found C.I. L. x. p. 366 f . Save for a terminus of the Gracchan triumvirs, the earliest Latin insc. appears to be one dating from 111 b.c. (ib. 3775), in which the magistri of one of the pagi record the building of a temple-wall. Of the Oscan inscc. of the town that we possess probably none are later than 211 or earlier than 400 B.c., see p. 108 and 143 inf .

[^25]The subsequent fortunes of the town concern us here but little. The favourite Gracchan project of reviving it by a colony of Roman citizens was carried out first by Cinna in 83 b.c., only to "bos. extinguished in the following year, but it was finally realised by Caesar- in 58 , and more than once endorsed by his successors. In 840 A.D. the town-was destroyed ${ }^{1}$ by the Saracens and in 856 its former inhabitants built for themselves a new town, the modern Capua, on the ruins of the ancient Casilinum. But the ancient site is again occupied by the flourishing town of S. Maria dit Capua Vetere, and in both there are archaeological collections fostered with sưme zeal. Indeed the Museum at (the modern) Capua is one of the most interf: esting in Campania, and its devoted founder and curator, the Canonico.".. Gabrielle Jannelli, will long be remembered by scholars.

Such excavations as have been made round Capua began in 1830 and have been carried on entirely by private enterprise. Hence, unhappily, there has been preserved no systematic record of their course. Since 1871 however they have been chronicled in the Atti della Commissione Conservatrice di Terra di Lavoro (published at Caserta), and in articles by Helbig and von Duhn in Bull. Inst. arch. Rom. The graves of different epochs have not, so far, been distinguished by varying locality or depth, but only in their construction, the older being cut in the tufa simply, the later lined with tiles; see Beloch Camp. ${ }^{2}$ p. 358 (cf. p. 355) and von Duhn on the tombs of Suessula in Bull. Inst. arch. Rom 1878 p. 150 and 1879 p. 141. The most important excavations for the Oscan period have been those in the fondo Patturelli and the fondo Tirone.

102-124 Heraldic dedications (ivivilas) from S. Maria di Capua.

This interesting group of inscriptions has been greatly enlarged by the discoveries of the last six years near Curti. Till 1888 we possessed only one complete insc. (105 inf.) and that a brief one. Now however they are numerous enough for us to recognise certain general characteristics which are an aid to their interpretation and to the restoration of those that are broken. 88 supra from Cumae must no doubt be added to the group.

General characteristics of the iivilas.
The group of inscc. now numbers 25 in all, not counting mere fragments. 13 bear emblems, and to 3 at least of them some

[^26]letter or alphabetic symbol seems attached-a point not hitherto noticed; the rest are either on blocks of tufa which may have served as bases to pieces of sculpture, or on tiles or small stelae of terra-cotta, which may have served (in two cases they certainly did) to direct attention to the iuvilu properly so-called which was placed elsewhere. 10 at least of the inscc. name some one mari as the dedicator; 4 of these 10 , and at least 6 others, mention a gens or corporation of some sort as having an interest in the monument. At least 7 record a past dedication or consecration, and in 5 of these the date of the year is added. At least 8 command some future ceremony to be annually repeated; at least 5 of these 8 and two of the preceding 5 add a particular day as the date of the ceremony. Further since one of them (104) contains nothing but this date and the command for a sacrifice, and others make no record of past ceremonies but only command them for the future, it is clear that in some cases at least the chief object of the dedication or erection of the iuvilu was simply to establish an annual performance of some such ceremony. 5 of them are duplicated; these are all on terra-cotta stelae and the insc. is repeated on the back under a different emblem, with an occasional variation in the order of the words. Of 1 further insc. (110) four identical copies are known to exist on four separate stelae all showing (on the same side) the same two emblems, and all four, it is said, found near together. 8 others are grouped in four pairs, one pair being cut on two sides of a single block, the rest on companion blocks found in each case close together, the two inscc. always having closely parallel contents but differing in certain details. In three of the pairs we find a distinction between two different kinds of ceremonies, sakrasias and kerssnasias, the former of which certainly implies a sacrifice, the latter possibly a banquet. A sacrifice is commanded in 2 other single inscc. Finally it is noteworthy that one of them is certainly dedicated to a deity, iuvei flagiuiz (108, one of the stelae with duplicate insc.).

The chief of these variations may be conveniently presented in a table. A dash means that the characteristic appears in the insc., a star that the insc. is mutilated at the point.


## Heraldic emblems elsewhere in Italy.

The use of heraldic devices is not unknown in Italy, though in Latin authorities it would seem to be rarely mentioned. The most striking example is to be found in the Tabulae Heracleenses (Kaibel Inscc. Gr. It. Sic. 645) where to every man's name ${ }^{1}$ is prefixed an alphabetic symbol and the description of an emblem or crest (e.g. $\dot{a}$ ä $\nu \theta \epsilon \mu a \quad \Phi \iota \lambda \omega \dot{\nu} \nu \mu o s \Phi_{\imath} \lambda \omega \nu \dot{v} \mu \omega, f \in$

 the use of these it is clear that the emblems belonged not to a single family, but to a gens or group of families, and that the alpbabetic symbols-which, as we have seen, seem to reappear in one or two of the iuvilas-belong to some group of gentes, a curia or tribe.

The only passage that I know of in Latin authors that clearly bears on the point is Ovid's description (Fasti 2. 511 ff ), of the Fornacalia and Stultorum Festa, long since cited by Bücheler, esp. 11. 525-30,

Curio legitimis nunc Fornacalia verbis
Maximus indicit, nec stata sacra facit;
Inque foro multa circum pendente tabella
Signatur certa Curia quaeque nota.
Stultaque pars populi quae sit sua Curia nescit
Sed facit extrema sacra relicta (al. -lata) die,
i.e. those who did not know what Curia they belonged to made their sacrifice all together on the Quirinalia or Stultorum Festa, Feb. 17 th, the Fornacalia being generally celebrated just before this. Of special insignia borne by individuals we have of course examples in Vergil (e.g. Aen. 10. 187), but his heroes know too much of Greek fashions to be safe authorities for things Italic.

[^27]Coats of arms seem to occur also on tombstones as in 90 sup., in C. I. L. ix. 2565 (Bovianum Undec.), 2502 (Saepinum) and 2659 (Aesernia); further ${ }^{1}$ in several at Bologna (belonging to what is known as the Villanova ${ }^{2}$ period), Not. Scav. 1893, p. 178 ff .

Nature and purpose of the emblems in these inscc.
The arms of the ioivilas so far as they have been preserved are shown in the following table. They are all in relief on slabs of terra-cotta, except no. 88 which is on a smallish block of tufa.

| No. of | Place | Gens | Front | Back |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 88 | Cumae | Tint[iria?] | Mirrors or palm leaves | None |
| 102 | Curti (Fondo Patturelli) | Saidia | Single sphere | None |
| 103 | " | Kluvatia | Woman's head in helmet with ear-coverings | Boar over A |
| 105 | " | " | Head of Apollo(?) radiate, with diamond-shaped fibula (?) under the chin. Under this is $\square$. | Boar |
| 111 | " | " | Woman's head with scarf (? Ceres) | Boar |

${ }^{1}$ At Gela in Greek graves of the black-figured-vase epoch but not earlier than 589 b.c. there are often found a pair of perforated dises of terra-cotta with a Medusa's head in relief, so frequently in fact that these are counted by the scavatori as a certain indication of a tomb (A. J. Evans in P. Gardner's Catalogue of the Greek Coins in the Ashmolean Museum, Oxford). But [W. R.] their frequency seems to indicate that they should rather be counted protective amulets like the scarabs, or like the figures of saints etc. on Roman Catholic graves in Ireland.
I.e. either Umbrian or Etruscan, belonging to 'the first iron epoch,' see Helbig, Hom. Epos ${ }^{2}$, p. 83 and 330 and the authorities there cited.

| No. of inse. | Place | Gens | Front <br> device | Back device |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 108 | Curti (Fondo Patturelli) | Kaesillia | 3 three-spoked wheels | Boar |
| 110 | Curti (Fondo Tirone) | Virria | Head of Minerva helmeted, over a boar | None |
| 112 | Curti (Fondo Patturelli) | Nasenia | 1 three-spoked wheel | Boar |
| 118 | " | ? | 5 bosses | Boar |
| 121 | " | ? | 3 bosses and 〕 | None |
| 122 | " | ? | Boar | None |
| 120 | " | ? | Head of matron (?) apparently with regular | None |

From this, I think, we may reasonably conclude that the Boar which appears on all but two of the Curti iuvilas belongs to some local curia or group of gentes, but that it was not absolutely necessary to add the emblem of this larger unit to the arms of the individual or gens.

Mowat (Rev. Archéologique 1887 p. 273 has pointed out that several of the emblems in this list reappear on coins and lingots of bronze of the 3rd century b.c. A boar not unlike that of e.g. 105 appears on an oblong quincussis ${ }^{2}$, the reverse of which has an elephant which must be later than the defeat of Pyrrhus at Beneventum in 275 B.c. The boar also appears on a bronze coin of Capua between 268 and 211 B.c., Friedl. Osk. Miinz. ii. 7. The head of Minerva in a helmet with three $\lambda$ ópoc (possibly an Athenian helmet) reappears on a libral as ${ }^{3}$, with an ox on the reverse over Roma in the exergue, while the Pallas-head in an Athenian helmet is a very common type indeed (e.g. at Tarentum and Velia). The wheel with three spokes appears in small silver coins of Cumae ${ }^{4}$ (before 421 B.c.) and on quadrantes of Iguvium ${ }^{5}$. The theory of these coincidences which was suggested by

[^28]M. Mowat was not convincing, and cannot be now maintained in the light of our larger acquaintance with the iivilas. A far more probable explanation is suggested to me by Professor Ridgeway. From all that has been said above it is perfectly clear that we are dealing with family or tribal emblems, and there are abundant examples of the use of the family emblem of the coining magistrate for the 'types' or 'symbols' of the coins he issued. Thus we learn that at Rome (Mom.-Blac. 2 p. 43) 'Vers la fin de la dernière guerre punique...les magistrats commencèrent à marquer leurs monnaies d'abord d'une symbole ou emblème distinctif, ensuite [even as early as 150 b.c. $v . i b .3$. 474] du nom de leur famille.... Vers le milieu du $7^{\text {me }}$ siècle ( 100 B.c.)...l'ancien type uniforme se trouve remplacé par les representations des exploits des aieux des jeunes patriciens chargés de faire frapper les monnaies de la Rép.' Examples may be found passim in Mom.-Blac. c. ix., e.g. ii. p. 372. But in the Italian communities the practice is of far earlier date ${ }^{1}$. For examples of magistrates' names compare Note iii. p. 15 sup. and makkiis ( 145 inf.), malss ( 152 inf.), Head Hist. Num. p. lxiii.

From these parallels it seems at least not improbable that the quincussis with the boar was cast by some mint-master who came from the neighbourhood of Capua, and not altogether impossible that the Minerva-head on the libral as may have a similar origin, but in the case of such common and, so to speak, such travelling types as this and the three-spoked wheel, the inference is very much weaker.

Chronology of the group.
The relative date of the different insec. may be determined by alphabetic considerations. They fall into three main classes:
(1) Inscc. Written in archaic Oscan $a \beta$ without $\overline{1}$ or $\mathfrak{u}$, with slanting cross-strokes ( $\lambda, \lambda, \uparrow$ etc.) and double interpuncts.

These are 101-105, and 111-112.
Of these 101-3 are the oldest as they alone have the form diuv- for the later iuv-, iův-.
${ }_{1}$ Well known Greek examples are the primitive $\Phi$ divos $\bar{\epsilon} \mu i \quad \sigma \hat{\epsilon} \mu \alpha$, and the action of Ptolemy, who after Alezander's death continued to issue coins with his master's types, but stamped above them in the field his own erest, wn anchor (derived from the legend of his birth). The rplimous which appears in the Tab. Heracl. as a gentile emblem is a constant type on the coins of Croton from $540-300$ в.c., but here its meaning must be different.
(2) Inscc. in full Oscan $a \beta$ with rectangular letters ( $\exists, \exists$ etc.), single interpuncts, but as yet no trace of Latin influence.

These are 108, 109, 113, 115, 116.
(3) Inscc. in full Oscan $a \beta$ but with certain forms (e.g. $N$ for Osc. H) showing Latin influence.

These are 88, 106-7, 110, 114, 117, 120.

108, which is mainly rectangular, has double interpuncts and shows uncertainty in the use of $i=1$ and $\mathfrak{u}$ and 118 and 123 which have rectangular letters but no $\mathbf{i}$ and $\mathfrak{\mathbf { u }}$, fall between classes (1) and (2). i is absent from 110, possibly through archaism. The fragmentary inscc. 121,122 may belong to either (2) or (3).

Towards fixing the absolute date of the inscc. the mention of a meddix or meddices is important. One such magistrate is named in 9 insec. but his description varies ; in $117 a$ and $b$ we have med. tiv. kapv. and medik. minive., in 119 med. kapv., in 107 and 109 med. tuiv., in 114 meddis pis uiniveresim(?) fust (the contrasted description in 113 is unhappily too injured to be certain), in $106,115,116$ we have simply med. It is certain, however, that none of these titles can have existed after 211 в.c., when the Capuan community was broken up by the Romans, (p. 100 sup.).

Secondly, the alphabet itself gives us a most valuable criterion, though, so far as I know, it has not been hitherto observed. In the Oscan coins of Capua and its dependencies ( $147-148$ inf.) which can be dated with certainty between 268 and 211 B.c., the oblique forms of $e, v$ and $t(\lambda, \lambda, T)$ have almost completely disappeared; that is to say, the regular forms on these coins are $\exists, \exists, T$, and though on a very few specimens the lowest bar shows a slight inclination (7), at least one bar is always strictly horizontal. This I ascertained by examining all the specimens in the British Museum, and in the specimens at Berlin according to the admirably full official description (Dressel's Beschreibung der ant. Münzen d. kön. Museen, Italien, Berlin 1894) there is not a single example of an oblique bar from Capua, Calatia or Atella.

It follows that group (2) of our inscc. is probably not much earlier than 268 B.C.; group (3) certainly later, group (1) considerably earlier.

So much then is fairly clear. There remain one or two other questions which in the present state of our knowledge cannot be answered with certainty.
(1) To whom are the objects dedicated, and
(2) In whose honour was the recurring festival held?
(3) What are the various bodies or groups (pimperias, vesullias? and not impossibly others) mentioned in the inscc. and in what, possibly varying, relations did they stand to the act of dedication?
(1) Only one of the inscc. explicitly dedicates its ioivilu to any one in particular, namely 108, which 'stands' to Jupiter *Flagius. The most obvious derivation for the word (d) iuvitit itself is from (d)iou- or (d)iouio-. But further, 109 relates to a iuvilui standing 'next to the door of the lucus' (which was presumably sacred to someone). A large number of the Curti specimens (all save 101, 103, 109, 110, and possibly 112 and 123) were found, as I learnt from Jannelil ${ }^{1}$, within the precinct of a temple identified as that of Juno Lucina from the countless votive statuettes and statues made in her honour ${ }^{2}$ which were found on the same site. It is quite possible [W. R.] that she shared the temple with her divine consort, as Dione shared with Zeus the temple at Dodona (Strabo 6. 7. 12), as Julius did that of Quirinus at Rome (Cic. Att. 12. 45; 13. 28; Dio Cass. 43. 45); as at Capua itself (C. I. L. x. 3812) Justitia, Nemesis, and the Fates were housed together in one temple, Hope, Faith and Fortune in another.

On the other hand 88 was found in the Necropolis of Cumae; the four examples of $110(v . i n f$.) are said by the discoverers (and their statement is accepted by Sign. Stevens of Naples) to have stood at the four corners of a grave; 101 was said by Minervini (r. inf.) to have been imbedded ('infissa') in a mass of tufa which covered a grave, and, if they did not stand in a temple, what other destination can we imagine for such monuments than the grave of an individual or a family? The close of 101 however, like that of 109 , seems to imply that there were several such monuments standing together and needing to be distinguished, which suggests a temple rather than a graveyard. The mere question of fact

[^29]is difficult to settle, for (Beloch, Camp. ${ }^{2}$ p. 471) 'the necropolis begins immediately outside the walls all round the city, so that every building outside it necessarily stood in the midst of graves.'
(2) But if these monuments were sepulchral, the repeated festival becomes at once intelligible, it is simply $\tau \alpha ̀ ~ \nu o \mu \iota \zeta ́ \rho \mu \in \nu a$ (variously called
 only refer to the Dictionary of Antiquities ${ }^{2}$ s.v. Funus and the reff. there given ; especially C. I. G. 2448 (Cauer ${ }^{2}$ 148) and Cic. Flace. 38, 95 which show that a banquet might be part of the proceedings. I find from a Latin insc. quoted from Marini Arval. p. 639 by Mommsen (Berichte d. sächs. Ges. d. Wissensch. 1850, p. 66 f.) that the custom was still in use in the 4 th century A.D.

But then what would become of Jupiter in 108? Until we have more evidence we must be content to be ignorant of the relation between these two apparently distinct methods of placing the iuvilas ${ }^{1}$.
(3) Observe that pimperias appears once (105) as the (presumably) nom. pl. alone, and once (certainly) nom. pl. as subject to priff(at)t(en)s (107), which shows the word must denote some collection of persons; on the other hand it occurs three times (114-5-6) in what must be the abl. pl., once with a temporal definition (pas prai mamerttiais set) and always in a clause parallel to others in other inscc. which clearly have temporal force (eidüus mamerttiaìs etc.).

This seems to put Buicheler's view beyond all doubt; namely that we have here the name of some bodies which met on regular occasions, so that in the abl. it might denote the date of their meeting, like Lat. gladiatoribus, comitiis, Lupercalibus etc.

The vesullias appear in the (presumably) nom. pl. (111) alone and in the (most probably not dative but) ablative (109), so that till we learn more of them, we had better treat them in the same way. If after all they prove to be goddesses, let us hope they will pardon our unwitting discourtesy.
${ }^{1}$ I do not know how to translate C. I. L. x. 3802 (Capua) $=$ clearly genuine insc. 'litteris magnis et bonis,' on three sides of a large travertine altar: manes | sacr | ioui, but (if the last word is not an abbreviation of the name of the gens Iovia) it seems to put Jupiter very close to the manes. C. I. L. x. 3803 (also from Capua) gives him an aedicula in common with the Lar (or Lares), which is less strange; and ib. 3815 makes a tombstone Plutoni sacrum instead of dis manibus: but none of these things yet persuades me that iuvei flagiui could stand on a tombstone, unless the second word should happen to mean 'infernal,' which does not seem probable; cf. rather Jupiter Fulmen Fulgur Tonans of C. I. L. xi. (Umbria) 4172, xii. 1807 al.

101 First published by Sogliano in Notiz. Scav. 1889 p. 22, and by Bücheler from an impression by Jannelli in Rhein. Mus. xliv (1889) p. 326 ; it is described also by Minervini, Atti d. Comm. Conserv. 1889 p. 23 ff.; it is now in the Museo Campano at Capua, where I saw it in April, 1894.

## diuvilam tirentium | magiium sulum muinikam | fisiais eiduis luisarifs sakrvist, iiuk destrst.

On a brick or tile 25 in . long and 6 in . broad ( 62 by $\cdot 15 \mathrm{~m}$.) which according to Minervini (l.c.) was imbedded in the outer face of one of two large blocks of tufa which were laid above a grave in the fondo Tirone (cf. 109 and 110). The insc. occupies only 16 in . of the length and was irregularly but very clearly engraved before the burning; in letters varying from 03 to .015 m . in height, in archaic Osc. $a \beta$ without $i$ and $\stackrel{\circ}{u}$ and with the cross strokes inclined ( $\uparrow, \checkmark, T$ and $\lambda$ which in 1.1 is almost in its Greek form 1). The single interpunct is regular, and the text perfectly clear, except perhaps for the $s$ of 1.2 whose top stroke is only just visible, though the letter is certain. Bücheler, Rhein. Mus. l.c.

Found in 1882 in the Fondo Patturelli, inaccurately published by Prof. E. Sosso in Atti d. Comm. Conservatrice 1883, p. 87; better by Bücheler, Rhein. Mus. 1884, p. 316, who gives a sketch by its possessor, Sign. Bourguignon, the Dutch Consul in Naples, where I saw it in April 1894.
(i) ek diuvil | upfaleis | saidiieis sakruvit | pustrei

$$
\begin{equation*}
\ldots . .\left|\frac{a}{l} \ldots . .\right| \text { a.... } \mid \text { f... } \tag{ii}
\end{equation*}
$$

(i) and (ii) are in two parallel columns separated by a vertical line on the face of a tile or earthenware stele now 9 in . by $4 \frac{1}{2}$ ( 22 by 11 m .). On the right of the insc., i.e. above it when the stele is turned upright, is a sphere or boss very slightly raised; the second column is almost entirely broken off. The $a \beta$ is earlier Oscan, and the cross strokes are inclined, the interpunct single and omitted at the end of 11.1 and 4 ; the loops of $d$ and $f$ are open, $v$ is $\lambda, 1 \sqrt{ }$. In (i) Sosso wrongly read diuvii, and saidiieis, where it seems improbable that $\mathbf{i}$ should appear beside $\mathbf{u}=0$ in
diuv- and pust-, and that it should not be used in the diphthongs ai, ei, if it were used at all; there is however a slanting cross stroke ( $\mathbf{Y}$ ) which I take to be accidental.

In (ii) the first sign visible $y$ seems to me more like $a$ or $d$ than $l$, which Biicheler read, since the cross stroke starts from the middle ; in the next line $\boldsymbol{a}$ is clear, and below it half of $\mathbf{f}$.

There is no insc. on the back.
Zvet. Inscc. It. Inf. Dial. 113.

103 Found in 1853 near Capua (no more exact spot is recorded), now in the Naples Museum, and seen by me in March 1894; facsim. Zvet. Osc. vi. 3.

## a. kluva.... | diuvia... | damu... <br> b. kluv.... | damuse.. | diuvia..

On two sides of a terra-cotta stele, broken off 9 in . from the top and 4 in . broad ( 23 by $\cdot 10 \mathrm{~m}$.) ; the letters are regular, 015 m . high, running lengthwise down the slab. At the end, i.e. above the insce. when the stele is upright, are figured a woman's head helmeted and a boar sketched with some spirit, on the sides ( $\alpha$ ) and (b) respectively. Under the boar is some emblem that looks like a large raised $A$. The cross strokes are inclined, and $\mathbf{u}$ is not used.
(a) $1 \mathbf{a}$ is certain. 2 After $\mathbf{i}$ is left a vertical with a vestige of a cross bar at the top.

Zvet. Osc. 36, Fabr. 2752.

104 Found on the Fondo Patturelli and now in the Museo Campano, where I saw it in April 1894; first published Not. Scav. 1889, p. 23, and by Zvet. Atti d. Comm. Conserv. Capua 1889, p. 168.

## eiduis ma[m s]akrid

On a stele in all some 8 in . long, 5 in . broad at the top, tapering to $2 \frac{1}{2} \mathrm{in}$. at the bottom (• $19, \cdot 125$ and $\cdot 062 \mathrm{~m}$.), complete save for a break in the middle which would allow very well for the restoration given above and generally accepted. The letters are $2 \frac{1}{4} \mathrm{in} .(03 \mathrm{~m}$.) high in older Osc. $a \beta$ with inclined cross strokes. On the back are some rough lines 09 which, if they are meant for ff, are very clumsy.

For the significance of the insc. see p. 102 sup.

105 Found in 1873 on the same site, now in the Museo Campano at Capua, where I saw it, April 1894; facsim. Zvet. Osc. vi. 1.

## a. pumperias pustm[as | kluvatiium <br> b. pum[p]erias pustm[as | kluvatiium

On two sides of a broken terracotta stele 14 in . by 4 ( 36 by $\cdot 10 \mathrm{~m}$.), (a) surmounted by a moulded head radiate, above some kind of garment fastened by a diamond-shaped fibula, (b) by a big boar very rudely incised; the inscc. run lengthwise, and are rough, but not irregular, in archaic Osc. a $\alpha$ without $\stackrel{\circ}{\mathbf{u}}$ and with the cross lines aslant; the letters are 1 in . ( 025 m .) high. On ( $\alpha$ ) between the lines, opposite to their second letters is $\square$ (or $Q$, but the tail may be accidental, though the rest cannot be). The interpunct in ( $a$ ) is at the foot of the $Z$, in (b) within its upper bend; the [p] of (b) 1 is lost in a fissure, the rest perfectly clear.

From the name and the emblems this stele appears to have been erected by the same family as the preceding, but, to judge from the style, certainly at an earlier date.

Zvet. Osc. 32.

106, 107 Found in 1887 on the Fondo Patturelli, and first published by Minervini, Atti d. Commissione Conservatrice, Caserta, 1887, then by Fior elli, Not. Scav. 1887 p. 290, and Bücheler Rhein. Mus. sliii. (1888) p. 128 with facsim. (from new paper impressions taken by Fiorelli). They are now in the Municipio of S. Maria di Capua Vetere, where I saw them in April 1894.

## 106 sepis | helevi| půmpe |fale r|iůvil de | virriieis | 7 medikia[ ${ }^{\text {i }}$.

## 107 <br> sepieis heleviieis sům.

mi anni|iei medik|kiai̊ tův|iůvi̊lam | průf's | 7, 8 piomper | faleniaas.

On two blocks of tufa 3 ft . by 16 in . ( 92 by $\cdot 40 \mathrm{~m}$.) and 31 in . by 20 ( 79 by 50 m. ) respectively, in regular Osc. $a \beta$, save that 106 has $\Pi$ twice instead of N , and 107 NV instead of Ht in the one word sům, else regularly HH . The letters are rectangular but rough, averaging $2 \frac{1}{2} \mathrm{in}$. (. 062 m .) in height, and were once coloured red. The interp. is single, and never used at the end of a line.
106. 1. 2 i is on the edge, and the final s may have been omitted merely for want of room. 4 the interpuncts between fal er are omitted by Fiorelli; the $\mathbf{r}$ may belong to pumpe of 1.3 , though it is not on the edge of the line, but further in than the $e$ of the line above. 5 vil , not vill, is clear ; Buich. gave a punct between $d$ and $e$ and in 7 between med and ikia, both probably accidental. 6 Fior. virriieis, clearly by a slip.
107. The first three words are written round the top of the stone, forming a sort of cap to the insc. Büch. gives a punct after helev, and there certainly is one now in the middle of the $\mathbf{V} .3$ Is the absence of the final $\mathbf{S}$ of the genitive, an abbreviation as in 106, 2? 5 Fior. - il-, not -il-; the stone is damaged, but there seems to have been a thorn, running into the middle of the $\mathbf{V}$. 8 the final as are added on the raised margin (where the first line is written) so that $a$ is opposite the end of 1.7 and $\$$ the end of 1.8 ; it is probable, if not certain, that they belong to falenia.

Was the Virrius whose magistracy here gives the date the celebrated Vibius Virrius, who roused Capua to revolt in 216 B.c. and died protesting against surrender to the Romans in 211 (Liv. 23. 6, 26. 13)?

108 Found in September 1873 on the Fondo Patturelli, now in the Museo Campano, where I saw it, April 1894; facsim. Zvet. Osc. vi. 2; a transcript of an earlier one by Jannelli, apud Bücheler, Jena Litteratur-zeitung 1874, p. 609.

## a. ekas iůvilas iuvei flagiui stahint | minnieis kaisillieis minateis ner.

## b. minieis kaisillieis minateis ner |ekas iuvilas iuvei flagiui | stahint.

Along two sides of a terracotta stele 21 in . by $5 \frac{1}{2}$ ( 53 by $\cdot 14 \mathrm{~m}$.), (a) beneath a vigorous moulding of a pig, (b) beneath three trirodia or trebly divided circles also moulded, not incised. The inscc. are back to back down the face and rear of the right-hand margin ; possibly the lower line of ( $\alpha$ ) should be read as the first (cf. 7 supro $\alpha$ ), so that ( $\alpha$ ) and ( $b$ ) would correspond in the order of their text, but differ in the arrangement of their lines, the first line being put on both sides nearest the edge. The letters of (a) vary from 007 to $\cdot 011 \mathrm{~m}$., those of (b) from 011 to 015 ; both are very roughly stamped, in regular Osc. $a \beta$, save that the use of $\mathbf{u}$ and $\stackrel{\circ}{\mathbf{u}}$, $\mathbf{i}$ and $i$ varies in the two sides, as appears in the text. Corssen (Philologus 1875 p. 115) wrongly read iư vei in both $(a)$ and (b), Biuch. (7.c) equally
wrongly iůvilas and iůvei in (b); the stele is beautifully preserved and every letter certain. The letters are fairly rectangular, save that the $\mathbb{1}$ is $k$, and the interpunct single except after ekas in ( $\alpha$ ), where it is double; it is omitted after the first name in (a) 2.

For this use of the verb corresponding to Lat. stare, cf. C. I. L. IX. 2565, where the insc. of a monument erected to one Q. Arruntius Iustus by the township concludes stat hereditati.

Zvet. Osc, 34.

109 Found in 1889 along with the complete example of the next insc. in the Fondo Tirone on the way from S. M. di Capua to Tifate, but not published till 1894, by von Planta Idg. Forschungen 4, p. 258, who gives a reduced facsimile.

## tr virriieis ken|ssurineis ekas | iuvilas tris

 4, 5, 6, 7 eh|peilatasset, ve|sulliais fertalis | staflatasset | mi 8,9 blussii mi m t. | nessimas staiet | veruis lůvkei.In full Osc. $\alpha \beta$ with horizontal cross-strokes and a half-rounded form of (C) (cf. 97 sup.) deeply cut before baking, so that the reading is everywhere certain. It runs across, instead of, as is usual, along the length of the stele, which now measures 16 in . in length by 7 in . in breadth and is about 1 in . thick ( 40 by $\cdot 17$ by $\cdot 03 \mathrm{~m}$.) ; the insc. covers the whole breadth, but only takes 11 in . of the length, 5 in . being clear beneath down to the edge, which is broken; if the stele itself held the coats of arms, they probably stood on the part which is lost below this, but like 101 sup. the insc. perhaps referred to some separate (and larger?) sculptures.

The name in 1. 7 is of course abbreviated (bluissiieis).
According to Liv. 23. 7 a Marius Blossius was 'Praetor Campanus' in 216 в.C. If with Beloch (Campanien ${ }^{2}$ p. 316) we regard this magistrate as the meddics tivetiks (see p. 51 sup.), it might be thought a tempting emendation to read Minius for Marius and identify Livy's Praetor with the m. t. of this insc., the more that there is a similar coincidence in 106. But the Virrian and Blossian families no doubt provided many meddices, cf. Cic. Leg. Agr. 2. § 93, where they are quoted as typical representatives of the old superbia Campana.

Since however we know from Livy the names of the meddices tutici from 217-214 and for 211, when they ceased, and (if his text is sound) no Minius Blossius is among them, this insc. must either have been written in 213-2 b.c., the years when Capua was hard pressed by Roman armies, or, more probably, before 217 в.c.
von Planta l.c.

110 On four terracotta stelae found, according to the information obtained by Sign. Stevens and Bourguignon of Naples, at the four corners of a grave, and, like the preceding inse., in the Fondo Tirone; the one which was first published (Bull. Inst. Arch. Rom. 1869 p. 73) is now in the British Museum, very well preserved save that it has lost by breakage the last two letters of 1.2 , and the last three of 1.3. The only complete example is in the possession of Sign. Bourguignon, at whose house I saw it in April 1894. The genuineness of the broken copies was at first disputed, but is now beyond doubt. Facsim. of the first found Zvet. Osc. vi. 4.

## viriium | vesuliais | deivinais

These vesulias-stelae clearly belong to the iovitio-group (though only 109 contains that word) because like the rest they bear emblems, namely a Pallas-head in a helmet adorned with a griffin, and underneath it, in a kind of raised frame, a boar. The complete specimen, which has lost a small piece of the blank tile at the lower end, measures 21 in . by $6 \frac{1}{2}$ ( 52 by $\cdot 16 \mathrm{~m}$.) ; the letters vary from $1 \frac{1}{8}$ to $1 \frac{1}{2} \mathrm{in}$. ( 028 to $\cdot 037 \mathrm{~m}$.). The $\alpha \beta$ is Oscan but has not and n and m are N and N . There is nothing at all on the back. For the gens Virria cp. the notes to 106 and 109.

Bücheler Rh. Mus. 1889 p. 330, Zvet. Osc. 37, Fabr. Suppl. I n. 496.

111 Found in 1876 on the Fondo Patturelli, now in the Museo Campano, where I saw it in April 1894; first published in Not. Scav. 1876, p. 100, more correctly by Zvet. Osc. 33, and Bücheler Rhein. Mus. 1878 p. 45 n., both from a facsim. by von Duhn.

## a. ves | klu

## b. vesulias. | kluvati

On two sides of a terracotta stele in regular Osc. $a \beta$; above ( $\alpha$ ) moulded in high relief is a woman's head, with its back covered with a scarf; above (b) the figure of a pig, only lightly and rudely scratched. The letters are archaic, $A, \lambda \exists T$, those of (a) $1 \frac{1}{8} \mathrm{in}$. high, those of (b) barely 1 in . (b) 1 the final letter is probably a reversed $s(S$, as it appears in Zvet.'s representation), though on the stele itself $\rangle$, which was first read, looks more likely: after it is a punct, and the lower half of a vertical ; $\Gamma$, which appears in Zvetaieff's photograph between the lines, does not exist in the original.

The image of the pig on the reverse must clearly have been an afterthought, added when the stele was already burnt, as indeed were the letters also, and that on both sides.

112 Found in 1888, published by Bücheler, Rhein. Mus. xliv. p. 329, from impressions taken by Jannelli, now in the Museo Campano, where I saw it, April 1894.

## mina naseni

On both sides of a long and complete terracotta stele ( 28 in . by $7 \frac{1}{2}=71$ by $\cdot 185 \mathrm{~m}$.), the height of the letters varying from 1 to $1 \frac{1}{2} \mathrm{in}$., in Osc. $a \beta$, with the figure of a pig at the head of one side, and $\triangle$ trirodium on the other, the insc. being identical on the two sides save that the letters are about $\frac{1}{4} \mathrm{in}$. smaller on the back. The interpunct is double, the cross-strokes slanting, and the general character of the letters archaic.

113, 114 Found in the Fondo Patturelli in 1888 and first published by Sogliano in Not. Scav. 1889 p. 23, then by Bücheler with a far better text from fresh impressions in Rhein. Mus. xlv. p. 161, now in the Naples Museum, where I read them in March 1894.
ůpil vi pak | tantrnnaium | iợvilas sakran nas 5, 6, 7 eiduiis malmertt........ | meddis, ......d | fust, iüviais me|ssimais staief | fuf; sakriiss sa|krafir avt | ůlti12 umam ker/ssnais.

## 114 ůpil vi pak | tantrnnaium |iůvil sakrann|pům5, 6, 7 periais | sůll .ikvi..ri.s | půn medd pis | ưiniveresim | fust; sakrid \| sakrafir.

Roughly engraved on two blocks of bad tufa about 40 in . ( 1 m .) high, each insc. being cut in a 'bed' which is 'sunk' or levelled out in $1131 \frac{1}{2}$ in., in 1142 in . back from the face, and which measures in both about 17 in . by $13\left(\cdot 42\right.$ by $\cdot 34 \mathrm{~m}$.). The letters average $1 \frac{1}{4} \mathrm{in}$. in height, but in 114 they are rather higher and the space between the lines is broader than in 113. The $a \beta$ is regular and rectangular, save that in 114 throughout we have the Latin $N$, the interpunct single and (no doubt) regular, the stones being now badly worn and exceedingly difficult to read, though there is no doubt as to any of the letters printed in the text, except those underlined.

113 1. 1 possibly $\mathbf{u}$ rather than $\dot{\mathbf{u}}$; for 1 Sogliano read $\mathbf{d}$, but the top bar looks to me accidental. 2 the second $a$ is spoilt by a 'fault' which makes it II : Büch. -ům, but I could see no punct. 3 the letters under-
lined are probable enough, though not quite certain. 4 has suffered much, but is clearer than the line before. 5 The reading of the broken part is most uncertain so far as the stone goes, but-iais is no doubt right, cf. 101,115 ; then Buich. gives půn. 6 after meddis nothing is certain but the final $\mathbf{d}$, and a before it is fairly probable; Buich. gives doubtfully pis idad, pis piad, or digitad; pis is clearly probable from 114. 8 is quite certain, pace Sogliano. 10 possibly $i$ rather than $i$, of $\mathbf{r}$ little is clear but the vertical and it might be d. 12 a few strokes some way after the last word are probably accidental.
1141.1 punct of $\mathfrak{u}$ not clear, 11 possible, 1 clear. 2 Büch. -ům, but I could see no punct; $\mathbf{n}$ is $N$, apparently the Osc. form made into the Latin. 3 -vil- and -vil- equally possible; im as in l. 2. 5 second word very doubtful, Buich. gives eikviaris; e might be $\mathbf{v}$ or $\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{k}$ more likely than $\mathbf{d}$, either uncertain, $\mathbf{v}$ fairly probable, ' $a$ more likely than $p$ ' (Biich.), but either uncertain, $r$ clear, then is or if (Buich. gives also in and m as possible). $\quad 6 \mathbf{n}$ has an accidental top bar $\nabla, m$ is clearly $N N$ not H. 7 there is vertical before the (injured) $\stackrel{\stackrel{\mathrm{u}}{2}}{ }$, which may be accidental; iu-, ai-, di-, ki- all seem possible, but not, I thought, $\mathbf{n}$ or $\mathbf{m}$, so that I do not venture to read miniv- on the model of $117 \mathrm{~b} .9 . \quad 8$ is fairly clear. 9 all but E quite clear.

Bücheler l.c., Conway Proceedings of the Camb. Philolog. Soc. 1890 p. 18, Buck Osco.-Umbr. Verb. System (Studies in Classical Philology, Vol. i, Chicago, 1895) p. 184.

115, 116 Found in the Fondo Patturelli and first published by Sogliano in Notiz. Scav. 1889, p. 22; 116 is now in the Museo Campano at Capua, 117 in the Museum at Naples, both seen by me in March and April 1894. Bücheler, Rh. Mus. xliv. (1889) p. 321, gives E text from impressions sent to him by Schuchardt.
ek iưvil sp ka|lůvieis inim | fratrům můi $\mid n i k$ est; $5,6,7$ fiisioais | pumperiais prali mamerttiais | pas set, kerssn|asias 1 pettieio s meddikiail |fufens.

116 ...l ...........|. kalůvieis ini|m fratrům | můinik est;
$5-8$ fiisiais pům|periai pas pr|ai mamerttiaĺㅗ set sakrasials 1 pettieis melddikkiai fuflens.

In regular Osc. $\alpha \beta$, with single interpunct, the letters rectangular, $1 \frac{1}{4} \mathrm{in}$. (. 037 m .) high, on two blocks of tufa, the insc. on each occupying a space about 21 in . by 17 ( 52 by $\cdot 42 \mathrm{~m}$.), a good deal spotted by weather. is used inconsistently. The only one that is certain is that in petti in 115.

115 1. 1. The fifth letter, generally read $h$, seems to me almost certainly $\mathbf{V}$; the supposed second vertical and the cross stroke are far shallower than any other lines in the insc. The engraver must have made a mistake, but discovered it before he had gone far. 3 u and $\mathfrak{u}$ are possible both in fratrům and muinik, but $i$ is certain, not ${ }_{i}^{i}$ 4 perhaps fis-, as the second $\mathbf{i}$ of the word looks rather like an accidental stroke. 6 ad fin. ais seems to me almost certainly meant by the $j$ of the stone, $\mathbf{r}$ is just possible, but the other examples of this letter have a larger lateral angle than this $(\triangleleft)$. The top stroke of the $\mathbf{s}$ is clear. 7 Bich. at first read kerssi, but now cf. $117 b$ and 114.
1161.1 only $\mathbf{l}$ is legible. $\quad 2$ there seems to be a punct before $\mathbf{k}$, and space for a letter before the punct; $I$ do not think any $\mathbf{i}$ in this line is $i$. 5 the two $\dot{i}$ may really be $\dot{i}$ with breakage; the punct in $\stackrel{\circ}{\mathbf{u}}$ is not certain. $\quad 6 \mathrm{~s}$ is separated from periai by a slanting stroke, which is simply the graver's first attempt at $\mathbf{s}$, abandoned because of the difficulty of cutting through a fault in the tufa; a blotch of the same kind appears in l. 7 before the last a, which is close to the edge ; tt is TT. 8 the first letter may be $\mathbf{i}$ or $\mathbf{i}$; it is close to the edge and it is clear that no letter has been lost before it. $\quad 9 \mathrm{tt}$ is $\Pi, i$ in -eis is certainly not $i$, and the same is true of every $i$ in meddikkiai.

Two members of this leading democratic family (perhaps the sons of Ofillius Calavius Ov. f. who appears in Liv. 9. 7) Ovius and Novius Calavii were the leaders of the anti-Roman movement at Capua in the great Samnite war, 314 b.c. (id. 9. 26). In 217 b.c. Pacuvius Calavius was made meddix by the democrats (id. 23. 2) and prepared the way for the alliance with Hannibal in the following year.

Biicheler, l.c.

117 Found in November 1887 in the Fondo Patturelli; first published by Sogliano Not. Scav. 1887, p. 560, then by Bücheler, Rhein. Mus. xliii. (1888), p. 557 (from a second impression of Bourguignon's). It is now in the Municipio of S. Maria di Capua Vetere, where I saw it in April 1894.
> a. ........rị... | kas..........n|
> ias pas fi..et | půstrei iůkleí|
> 5, 6 eehiianasům|aet sakrim |

## fakiiad kasit | medikk tůvtik

## 9, 10 kapv adpůd / fiiet.

b. ..............|.. ilas....via. |
pa. medikkia. | tů vtik kapv.. |
5, 6 sakraitir ka[s]it|damsennias | pas fiiet půstr|iůklei vehiian | 9, 10 medik minive | kersna[s]ias.

On two sides of a tufa-stone mutilated at the top, 41 in . by 18 ( 1.08 by $\cdot 45 \mathrm{~m}$.) with a raised border. Beside it was an altar of tufa, with a terracotta statue. The letters are from 1 to $1 \frac{1}{2} \mathrm{in}$. high ('03 to $\cdot 04 \mathrm{~m}$.), lightly, and here and there carelessly engraved in regular Osc. $\alpha \beta$ ( $\mathbf{e}, \mathrm{v}$ and t all perfectly rectangular) and once coloured red; the lines are separated by a space varying from 1 in . to nothing. The stone is so worn and spotted that the interpuncts and diacritics are uncertain, but the text is on the whole clear.
(a) l. 1 only $\mathbf{r}$ is clear. 2 Bourg. himself read kl.....l....m, but kas or das seem to me certain; ad fin. Büch. damsen]n|ias from (b). 3 init. Sogl. tas; but ias is clear; after fi are the lower halves of two verticals, hence Buich. fi[ii]et. 5 ee -is clear, but so is $v e$ - in (b) 8 inf. $\quad 7$ Sogl. wrongly fakiiad. 8 the second $\mathbf{k}$ is now a $\mathbf{d}$, thanks to an accidental cross-stroke. 10 the second i has a thorn on the left which is certainly, as Buich. thinks, accidental. Sogl. took it for a reversed 1.
(b) 2 of the first word only the $\mathbf{a}$ is at all certain; the final $\mathbf{a}$ is doubtful. $\quad 3$ pas is possible; of the following m only a vertical is left; of the final -ia, $i$ has disappeared, and $a$ is uncertain. 4 the second $t$ of tưvtik is damaged and has very little room; then Buich. read datv, but I feel fairly confident of the text; at least three verticals are visible after V , the middle one curving a little. 5 after sakra the lower halves of three verticals, certainly not 8 (as in 113), the text is fairly certain; the final -it is obscure. 6 is clear. 7 the first $\mathbf{i}$ is very long, and possibly $=\bar{i}$, or II may $=-i \dot{i}$, both of which values appear in Roman inscc. from the Sullan epoch onwards ${ }^{1}$; between the two is an accidental

[^30]cross-stroke. The last letter of 7 is on the edge, and so in 8 , where the $I I$ is written smaller. 9 perhaps medik if $f$ is for $t$ and not an injured 1. 10 Buich. at first read kersnaiias, but gave in to 113 and 115.

Buicheler, l.c.

118 Purchased in March 1894 in Curti (and therefore probably found on the Fondo Patturelli) by Sign. Bourguignon of Naples, who showed it me in April. First published by me (at Sign. Bourguignon's request) in Rein. Mus. clix. (1894) p. 480. Since then Not. Scav. 1894, p. 405.

## a. iuvilu.. | sakrak..|ve.na <br> b. i]uvilu.. |sakrid.

In older Osc. $a \beta$ on a terracotta stele 7 in . broad and now broken short off $8 \frac{1}{2} \mathrm{in}$. from the top ( 175 m . by $\cdot 22 \mathrm{~m}$.) and 3 in . thick. At the right-hand end, ie. above the inscc., are on the front $(a)$ a raised crest of 5 hemispheres (apples ?), on the back a boar. The lines occupy about half the breadth of the face; the letters on the front were cut before baking, those on the back seem rather to have been incised afterwards, at least they are far less deeply cut. All are clear save the third sign of 1.3 on the front, which is broken and looks like R ( $\mathbf{r}$ seems to me more likely than $\mathbf{l}, \mathbf{n}$, $\mathbf{s}$, or a). After sakrid on the back is an interpunct and a hasta left on the edge.

Conway, lc.

119 Found in 1723 'near Capua,' now lost; first published by Mazochi, Saggi dell' Acc. di Cortona tab. III, (and in his Opuscula, Vol. II (Naples 1775), Dissert. 1, Diatriba 5, II. p. 144, with Tav. ii, where I found it in the Naples Museum Library, March 1894) whence Nom. U.D. viii. 14 (p. 177), whence Zvet. Oc. 41.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { aka tris ... } \mid \text { med kapva | } \\
& \text { sakra .use } \mid \text { e a a milia } \mid \\
& n[\mathrm{e}] \text { ssimas }
\end{aligned}
$$

According to Mazochi's account and sketch the letters are in rude but regularly written Osc. $\alpha \beta$, on a block of soft tufa, which was 'integer erutus' and had only 'quatuor liters deperditas in re ado friabili,' ie. the four blanks
in 11. 3-5. The interpunct is double, and appears after the first word of 11. 1, 3,4 (but not in 1. 2) and at the end of 11.4 and 5 , which certainly suggests that other words are lost in the same line. After $\mathbf{S}$ in 1.1 Maz . gives three verticals without any note of injury to the stone. Despite Maz.'s statement Mommsen thought that part of the inse. was lost on the left, and would restore tristamentud in 1.1 ; but in the light of 109 sup. tris was probably a complete word. 1. 5 Büch. me]ssimas, but cf. 109. It is probable though not absolutely certain that the insc. referred to a jovila (so Büch. Rhein. Mus. xlv. p. 163), rather than to a public erection.
U.D. p. 177, Zvet. Osc. 41, Fabr. 2751.

120 Found near Capua in 1853, now in the Naples Museum, where I saw it, March 1894; facsim. Zvet. Osc. vi. 5.
ni.. | fiis | vesu

Osc. $\alpha \beta$, but with Lat. $N$, the letters from $\frac{1}{2}$ to $\frac{2}{3}$ in. ( 015 m .) high; lengthwise on a fragment of a terracotta stele now 9 in . long by $4 \frac{1}{2}$ broad ( 24 by $\cdot 113 \mathrm{~m}$. ), beneath a neatly moulded woman's bust, with what Prof. Ridgeway guesses to be a matron's rolls of hair. Several letters must be lost at the end of each line, and the soft terracotta has suffered considerably from the fork or spade of the excavator, which has produced diagonal lines (all running parallel) and dots that make a facsim. misleading.

Thus there is a punct in the $N$ of 1.1 and two puncts in 1.2 , one to the right of each $\dot{i}^{1}$. In 1.2 Pauli ${ }^{2}$ misled by one of these cross-strokes read fas, and the last sign, whatever it was, is effaced by another similar stroke which is certainly not $\leq$ letter. $3 \mathbf{u}$ is more likely than $\stackrel{\circ}{\mathbf{u}}$.

Zvet. Osc. 38, Fabr. 2756.

121, 122 Found in 1876 on the Fondo Patturelli, and now in the Antiquarium, Berlin : published by von Duhn, Bull. Inst. Arch. Rom. 1886, p. 184.

> 121 ve..
> 122 fi. $|\mathrm{f}|$ deiv

On two fragments of terracotta, 121 beneath the figure of a pig, 122 beneath three raised dises or hemispheres, the backs of both fragments being bare. After fl in 122 von D. read a sign 0 .

Zvet. Osc. 35 and 39.

[^31]123 Found near Curti in March 1894 (I could not obtain more precise information) and now in the Naples Museum. I saw it while it was still in the possession of Sign. Salv. Pascale of Curti ; it is now published in Not. Scav. 1894, p. 147.

## ni... ${ }^{\mathbf{d}} \mathrm{ni} \mid$ nium | pumpe|ri mam |tu

Deeply cut in older Osc. $a \beta$ (contrast pumperi with půmp-in $106-7$ ) the letters $1 \frac{1}{2} \mathrm{in}$. high on the upper 7 in . of a rough block of good tufa 19 in . high by $11 \frac{1}{4}$ broad ( 475 m . by ${ }^{\circ} 28$ ) and averaging 5 in . in thickness. The top surface of the block is fairly even, but does not seem cleanly sawn, so that from the appearance it is not clear whether the insc. has lost at the beginning anything more than the upper halves of the letters in the first line; and it is quite complete at the sides. But if it be a jovila, a statue or embleun and a part of the insc. may have been broken off at the top. 1. 1 two letters' space is broken after the first $i$, after $d$ there is a space, but nothing save an interpunct can have stood there, as no stroke appears in the part of the line left before $\mathbf{n}$; a little distance after the second $\mathbf{i}$ is a stroke about lin . long inclining upwards to the left, on a level with the rest of the line; it is not part of a letter, since the stone all round it is perfectly smooth and uninjured; nor does it seem to serve the purpose of a smaller but similar mark in 286 inf.; is it a mark of punctuation? 3,4 the letters ri are turned sideways, thus: $\begin{aligned} & \exists \Pi H \mathcal{H} \cap \Pi \\ & \nabla \quad H \mathcal{N H}\end{aligned}$, which confirms the reading faleniaas in 107 sup., both being due to the wish not to split a word between two lines. 5 after tu there is a small stroke slanting downwards to the left, possibly accidental. No lines are lost beneath.

All the words seem to be abbreviated; but the resemblance of the insc. generally to 105 and $106-7$ seems to indicate that it is one of the same class.

124-129 Small terracotta fragments, possibly of similar insec., found at various times on the Patturelli site; 124 was published Not. Scav. 1887 p. 291, 125-128 ib. 1889 p. 23, 129 in Bull. Inst. Arch. Rom. 1886 p. 168. All but 124 and 129 are in the Museo Campano, where I saw them in April 1894, 124 was once in the possession of Sign. Califano of S. M. di Capua Vetere, 129 is on a tile in the Berlin Antiquarium.

| 124 | mamert | 127 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 125 | sak]rid | 128 sům |
| 126 ma | 129 mame |  |

All six fragments are in regular Osc. $\alpha \beta$. 126-128 are in relief and set in a channel or band running down the middle of their respective stelae, so that the letters are in a kind of frame; but they are all of different sizes, so that they do not belong together. The two parts of 127 are separated by a space in which some letter (? k ) appears to have been erased.

130-136 Other Inscriptions from Capua.

## 130 The Curse of Vibia.

Found in the beginning of 1876 close to the tomb in which 131 had been found before, on the Patturelli estate at Curti, in the Capuan necropolis; now in the Museum at Naples, where I read it in April 1894. Buicheler gives a lithographic facsim., with full comments in Oskische Bleitafel, cf. also his letters to Bugge in the Latter's Altitalische Studien.

On a roll of lead plate, which when opened measures about $\cdot 22 \mathrm{~m}$. long by 08 m . at the broadest part ( $8 \frac{3}{4}$ by 3 in .). The two ends of the roll, i.e. the top and bottom of the plate, are seriously damaged, and so is the extremity, i.e. the left-hand margin of the inscription. Inside are 12 lines of writing, $\frac{1}{8} \mathrm{in}$. high, covering the whole length of the plate, but leaving about an inch free at the bottom; outside, on the back of this . space, a single line, which is much mutilated, runs along the whole length. The insc. is carelessly written in Oscan $a \beta$ with no double letters and probably no $\vdash$; whether any $\vee$, and if so, which of them, have the diacritic ( $\mathcal{V}$ ), in the present condition of the lead it is impossible to say. $\mathbf{t}$ is always t , but the letters generally are rectangular ( $\exists$ oftener than $\lambda$ etc.). From the fairly certain restoration of 1,3 Buich. estimates that not more than 10 or 11 letters are lost at the end of each line; Bugge thinks fewer; in any case, in $11,7 \mathrm{ff}$., of which three or four more letters are preserved, there must be that number less to be supplied. These and other gaps are in the text measured
according to Büch. The words are generally (less frequently towards the end) separated by : or .
a. keri arent[ikai man]afum pai pui...u. heriam suvam legin[um. |usurs inim malaks nistrus pakiu kluvatium †valamais p[uklu]... kadum damia.......... | leginum aflukad; idik t[i]fei manafum; vibiiai prebaiampu.ulum da[da]d; keri 4 ar[entikai.... | valaimas puklum inim ulas leginei, svai neip dadid, lamatir. akrid eiseis dunte. $\qquad$
(a) 1 I could see nothing of the man which Büch. read in 1877; no punct is clear after ..afum; only the lowest angle of the $\mathbf{u}$ (?l) after puị appears, Büch. conj. pui pui or pui puh. n of legin fairly clear; ad fin. Büch. reads -akai, the second a seemed to me the least doubtful of these almost hopeless signs, Bugge conj. suvam ehsakaratus aflukid ('exsecratos adigit'). 2 the interp. after malaks was clear to me. $p$ of pakiu is a correction of $k$; after -tiu only 1 is visible, Büch. Bugge d, but m seemed to me fairly certain. Büch. corr. valaimais as in 1. 12, Bugge valaimas, as in 11. 4, 8 and 10. Only three upright strokes are now visible; Büch. ani, Bugge ant; of kadum (Büch., Bugge) only the first and last letters were visible to me. Bugge damiantud suvam, but the last visible sign looks now more like uthan a. 3 tfei is either an abbreviation or miswriting for tifei. manafum, the $\mathfrak{u}$ is a correction of a which had been first incised, and it is cut more deeply than the a was; Bugge puts no stop here. There is a slight interp. after pre which Büch. regards as a compounded preposition, reading prebaiam pu[k]ulum; Bugge prebai ampu[l]ulum; interp. uncertain before and after da[da]d, which seems a certain restoration. At the end Büch. adds inim. 4 No interp. visible after either of the first three words; the $i$ of lamatir is $h$, but the thorn may be

5 inim kaispatar in [im] krustatar svai neip avt svai tiium idik fifikus pust eis.......... | pun kahad, $\dagger$ pvt n...rnum neip putiad punum kahad, avt svaipid perfa........[ni | putiiad, nip hu[n]truis nip supruis aisusis putians pidum putians ufteis udf...... | 8 valaimas puklui pun far kahad nip putiiad edum nip menvum limu pi....... | pai humuns bivus karanter. suluh pakis kluvatiis valaims puk turumiiad 1.........| vibiiai akviiai, svai puh aflakus
accidental; ad fin. Büch. Bugge -teis. 5 No interp. after the first inim, the second svai, fifikus or pust. There ought perhaps to be a full stop at kaispatar. Büch. eisuk, Bugge eisui. 6 The $p(\Pi)$ of $p v t$ may be an a $(\mathbb{N})$ with the cross stroke omitted as in 1.12 (and as it seems to me to be in the a of the avt further on in this same line), so Büch. Bugge corr. put ( $\mathbf{u}$ for $\mathbf{v}$ ) i.e. pod, Lat. quod, and then nenernum, and the second e seems probable from the shape of the break before the r. Ad fin. Büch. -akium herid neip, Bugge -ahtum id, ni ('perfectum it, ne'). In this line no interp. clear after the first three words, nor after putiiad, punum or avt. 7 Tabula hu.truis; ad fin. Bugge udfakium. No interp. except after supruis and the last three words. 8 Biich. corr. puklu(m), beginning a new sentence with valaimas, Bugge keeping the puklui (which is clearly visible) connects the two words with what precedes; ad fin. both suggest pidum eisunc 'quoquam eorum'. Clear interp. only after putiiad. 9 Interp. only after kluvatiis. valaims is an abbreviation of either valaimas or valaimais; $t$ in turumiiad might be an $i$, but seemed fairly certain (so Büch. also); ad fin. 1 might be part of an a or $\mathbf{u}$, Bugge conj. luvfrum (nom. neut.), connecting it with the following dative, while Buich. punctuates at turumiiad and supposes the gap to contain the main verb of the new sentence. 10 Interp. only after akviiai and svai.
pakim kluvatiium valaimas puklui supr....... | inim tuvai leginei inim sakrim, svai puh aflakus 12 huntrusteras huntrusa....... | valaimais puklu *avt keri aretik[ai] avt ulas leginei ..h.r.as trutas tus..........
(b) keri arentika[i] pai pui suva t.........egin krus...........

Both Büch. and Bugge would corr. puklui to -klum or klu; ad fin. Büch. supru.. Bugge suprus...; the $r$ is rather above the level of the preceding letters, but can scarcely belong to 1.9 as it would follow the 1 immediately. 11 Interp. only after tuvai, and apparently in the middle of two words, after sak and the first hunt; ad fin. Büch. makes huntru a separate word, Bugge huntrus teras, huntrus a[pasum? v. Gloss. 12 Interp. after the first three words only. Bugge corr. valaimas. $\quad a$ in *avt has no cross stroke, i.e. $=p(\Pi$ for $\nabla)$. $\mathbf{k}$ in keri is a correction of $\mathbf{r}$ or $\mathbf{v}$. I can make nothing of the word after leginei. Bugge suggests nuhtirnas, which is quite possible. Note that the lithograph here is misleading; v. Büch. Osk. Bleit. p. 59. The last letter of the line is more probably $\llbracket$ than $g$. Bugge supposes the main verb lost here, and therefore puts a stop at akviiai in 1. 10.
(b) No interp. after pai or pui, after suva $t$ is more probable than h. Only the lowest stroke of the last $\mathbb{1}$ is left, and the $u$ before it is $x$.

The fashion of writing curses in a foreign language, especially in one that was dying out (see the article in Am. J. Phil. cited below), makes it conceivable that 130, 131 and 137 were all written in the Roman period, i.e. after 211 (though scarcely after 150) B.C. But the character of the $a \beta$ in these two, which seem the earlier, inclines me to refer them rather to the

III century, before the older forms of the letters had been quite forgotten.

Compare Note xxxv. p. 329 inf., and on ancient curses generally see Wachsmuth, Rhein. Mus. 1867, p. 570 ff., Conway, Am. Journ. Phil. x. (1889), p. 453 ff. On this insc. Büch. Oskische Bleitafel, Frankfurt a. M. 1877 (reprinted from Rh. Mus. xxxiii. (1878) p. 1 ff.). Bugge, Altitalische Studien, Christiania 1878. To these Deecke (apud Zvetaeiff, Inscc. It. Inf. Dial. app. p. 181) adds little. Bréal, Revue Critique 1878, p. 89. Zvet. Osc. 50.

131 Found in 1857 at Curti, in the Capuan necropolis, beneath the remains of a Roman grave, now in the Naples Museum, where I read it in March 1894: first edited by Minervini in Bull. Arch. Nap. n. s. v 99, then by Fiorelli Catal. Mus. Naz. racc. epigr. 1. p. 37. A facsim. by de Petra is given Zvet. Osc. vii. 5. Fragments of two other similar plates were found with it, but are said to have been thrown away.
> steniklum virriis
> tr..piu virrriiis |
> plasis bivellis |
> ůppiis helleviis |
> 5 luvikis ůhtavis|
> statiis gaviis nep fatium nep deikum putians |
> luvkis uhtavis nůvellum velliam | nep deikum nep fatium pitiad
> 9 nep memnim nep ůlam sifei heriiad.

On a roll of lead plate, which when opened measures 7 in . long by 3 high ( 175 by $\cdot 072 \mathrm{~m}$.), the letters a little over $\frac{1}{8} \mathrm{in}$. ( $\cdot 003 \mathrm{~m}$.) high, irregularly but clearly written in the latest Osc. $\alpha \beta$, save that the thorn of 1 is generally inclined, and the use of $\stackrel{\circ}{\mathrm{u}}$ is inconsistent ( $\mathrm{u} h \mathrm{u}^{-}$, $\mathbf{u h t}$-, put-, put-). The lines are very unequal; 1.6 more than fills the length of the plate, and
its last letter is added above ; 1.7 just fills it. The new paragraph (is it a new curse altogether?) is marked by a rough horizontal line drawn from the margin above the words luvkis uhtavis.

The variation in the direction of the letters is remarkable. The insc. is mainly, written from left to right, and the Oscan signs reversed ( $\square,-1$, , $i 1, S$, etc.), but, except in $11.1,2,4$ and 5 , their normal position is frequently retained, as will be seen by the following transcript of the other lines, where the letters in capitals denote the signs that begin from the right in the true Oscan style ( $i, u, p, t, f$ are of course indifferent):
plasIs bivellis....statiis gaviis Nep fatium Nep deîku⿳ uhtavis nuvelluм velliam nep deikum nep fatĩuм ${ }^{1}$ puitiad, nep meмnim Nep iulam 2 -fee heriiad.

From this it seems to me clear that the variation is not due to ignorance of Oscan, but to a conscious attempt to write it from left to right. Except the 1 in sifee all the variant letters have oblique strokes ( $\mathrm{N}, \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{H}, \zeta$ ) so that their direction probably seemed a matter of indifference. The motive of the change of order was no doubt magical. See the note to the preceding insc.

1. 1 is faint, but the reading is certain; all the letters are rather far apart; there is no interpunct after steni, though editors have generally printed it as a separate word. 2 No interp. after tr, and the next signs are $\angle 日$ which have been read stla-, tla-(so Deecke, comparing Etr.-Lat. Thalpius), and fla-, but elsewhere in this insc. 1 is always $L$; the lowest cross stroke in both signs may be accidental, at all events that in the second letter; the first letter might be a correction of 1 made in the wrong direction, but on the whole I think tr ippiu is the most likely reading, since $\bar{I}$ is on this insc. regularly $\lambda$. $3 \underline{\underline{l}}$ is obscure but probable; e has an accidental side stroke. $\quad 5$ Interp. after $\mathrm{u} h . \quad 7$ the second V has a small thorn in the middle, but is not $e$, whose middle stroke is longer : interp. wanting after nuvellum, and after the two infinitives in 1. 8. $\quad 10$ perhaps herilad.

Corssen discussed this insc. in Kuhn's Zeitschr. xr. p. 338. Zvet. Osc. 49, Fabr. 2749.

[^32]132 Found in the Fondo Patturelli near Curti, now in the Museo Campano at Capua, where I saw it April 1894; a facsim. was published by Galozzi in Notiz. Scav. 1887, p. 378, and by Minervini Atti d. Comm. Conservatrice, Caserta, 1888, p. 8.

## pupu frip ek kelledehad

A ring of letters $\frac{1}{4}$ to $\frac{3}{8} \mathrm{in}$. high, roughly incised after the glazing, round the neck of a nicely finished implement (?) of white glazed terracotta, four inches high in all ( $\cdot 1 \mathrm{~m}$.), whose nature is a riddle; see the woodcuts. The

insc. is retrograde in Osc. $a \beta$; the signs for $a(\Gamma)$ and $p(\Pi H)$ are curious, and, if they are due to anything but the difficulty of writing on such a ground, may show Etruscan influence. There are no interpuncts, so that the division of the first three words in the text is arbitrary; it would be natural to divide kelled ehad but that the letters dehadpupu are rather larger and more widely spaced than the rest; and this is the only indication, if such it be, where the sentence begins.

The first and second $\mathbf{p}(\Pi)$ were read as $\mathbf{n}$, and the third as $\mathbf{a}$, by Minervini; there is a very faint spot in the first $\mathbf{u}$, but I scarcely think it is $\dot{\mathbf{u}}$; the second $\mathbf{k}$ is $\rangle \mid$ (while the first is $\rangle$ ) so that we should perhaps read igelled (Minerv. supposed an iomitted by oversight, ek[i]kelled, supposing the first part to be Osc. ekilk 'hoc').

The object can hardly be a basis as I at first (Class. Rev. vir. (1893) p. 468) inferred from Galozzi's description, since when the letters are upright the cup is uppermost. The two holes in the rim suggest, perhaps, that it was to be hung up (as a votive object?). It differs from the very numerous and heterogeneous offerings found in the temple of Juno Lucina on the Fondo Patturelli, and now in the Museum at Capua, in that almost if not quite all of them are unglazed, even when finely executed; in particular I could not find a single glazed specimen among the hundreds of girl-dolls (pupae) which the Museum contains. Hence I doubt the explanation offered in Class. Rev. l.c. No one of four or five well-known archaeologists whom I consulted in Italy and England could recall any similar object.

133 Found in 1873 near Capua, on the Fondo Tirone in the estate of Sign. Orazio Pascale, who sold it to the collection of Count Michel Tyszkiewicz, Trinita de' Monti, Rome; facsim. Zvet. Osc. vii. 6.

## arafiis | vibis

On the boss of a gold ring, in Osc. aß, inscribed in a series of dots, from left to right, except the two $\mathbf{s}$ which are the regular Osc. $\langle$ as they stand on the ring, but which would form the Lat. $s$ in an impression taken from it, if we assume, as I think we must, that the ring was used for a signet. This letter then, as well as the form of a (A), does show Latin influence; which, however, the apparent direction of the writing, pace Zret., does not warrant us in assuming.

Zvet. Osc. 51.

## 134-136 Painted Epitaphs.

These were diseovered in tombs at S. Maria di Capua Vetere ; the first two were found in 1867 in a tomb containing two cellae, and published by de Petra, Giom. d. Scav. Pomp. n. ser. I, p. 235. Zvet.'s photograph of 134 and 135 a, taken in 1875 (Osc. vii. 2), shows that the paint of the latter had even then considerably fallen away. The others in 135 had then vanished or been covered in again. The two inscc. of 136 were discovered in 1872, and inaccurately published, by Helbig among others (Bull. Inst. Arch. Rom. 1873, p. 125); a photograph taken by Jannelli is given by Zvet. Osc. vii. 3 and 4. 134 and 135 a are in the Naples Museum, 136 in the Museo Campano at Capua; I saw all these in March and April 1894. They are all in. Osc. $\alpha \beta, 134-5$ in red paint, 130 in black.

In letters 2 in . ( 051 m .) high, on a niche at the end of the left-hand cella. The interpunct is single; in -tir and -eis the $\$ is now only $\mid$, but at some distance from the preceding letters, and therefore probably was once $F$.

On the niche on the left-hand side of the same cella was the symbol V .

In letters $2 \frac{1}{2} \mathrm{in}$. ( -064 m .) high on three fragments of a plaster cornice, in the right-hand cella.

The interp. was double after the second name, but wanting after the first. The text I have given according to de Petra; these two have been transferred to the Museum at Naples, and, while the first is complete, of the second only upfals.a.av...minie is left.

## b. $\min u$

On the first recess of the cella. There seems to be an interp. after II and then a space for two letters before $\mathbf{u}$.

## c. kluv...

On the second niche of the same cella. The text of $(b)$ and $(c)$ is from de Petra, l.c.

Zvet. Osc. 42-46.

## b. vibis smintiis

The letters in (a) are $1 \frac{1}{2} \mathrm{in}$. (.037), in (b) $2 \frac{1}{4} \mathrm{in}$ ( $\cdot 056 \mathrm{~m}$.) high, and painted black on plaster ornamented with frescoes in colours: (a) was in fragments, which were set together by Minervini; in (a) and (b) the interpunct is double, but in (a) it is only visible after the third and fourth words; $u$ may once have been $\stackrel{\circ}{\mathrm{u}}$. The arms of $\boldsymbol{V}$ incline downwards and $\mathbf{t}$ is $T$, which with the double interpunct indicate a fairly early date.

Zvet. Osc. 47-8.

Note xil. On a large fragment of hard piperno-stone which covered a tomb, found in 1883 on an estate of Sign. P. de Rosa, at Capua (Casilinum) in the neighbourhood of Sparanise, the ancient territory of Calenum; now in the

Museo Campano where I saw it, April 1894 ; it has not, I believe, been hitherto ' published.'

## $s m$

The letters are very deeply cut, the S 12 in . bigh, the $N V$ only half the height; the slanting strokes of both are made in the wrong direction. For other huge letters cf. inscc. at Pentima p. 248 inf ., but I do not feel convinced that this was cut in antiquity.

137-141. Inscriptions from uncertain parts of Campania.

137 Fragments of a lead-plate like 130 and 131 supra, probably containing a curse, recently presented to the Naples Museum, where I read it in March, 1894; first published (in transcript) by von Planta, Indg. Forschungen II. p. 435. It is said to have come from Pozzuoli or Cuma.

| $a$. |  | d. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| p... |  | ..V...sis $\mathrm{nu} . .$. |
| u... |  | ...n..villis |
| ga... |  | ...tiis gnaivs f... |
| luv... |  | ...pakulliis |
| s pak... | 5 | ...kersnu veleh... |
| inim... |  | ...ahiis mara... |
| dek... |  | ...sahiis upf... |
| kin... |  | ...s papeis |
| ..... |  | ...s marah |
|  | 10 | ...s kavkvis |
|  |  | ...utiis m... |
|  |  | ...ns e... |





#### Abstract

\section*{$j$.} (There seem to be one or two Osc. signs on this, a larger, fragment, but none certain enough to be worth transcribing. On the back are the symbols described below.)


(a) 9 contains the upper tips of two letters, both uncertain. (b) 1 the first letter is d or $\mathbf{k}$, the third has only a hasta left. 3 after $\mathbf{v}$ a hasta is left. (c) 6 m is H . 12 the last sign is $V$, i.e. the corner of $\mathrm{m}, \mathrm{l}$ or r , not of d . (d) 4 ends with double interpunct. 5 after $\mathbf{h}$ is $L$ (not $L$ ) the beginning of V or more probably $\mathbf{r}$. 6 the letter before h looks to me more like E than another h. 7 s- may be b-. 9 ad fin. von P. s but it looks to me more like $\mathbf{h}$. 12 e might be $\mathbf{k}$. (e) 1 von P. gives an $\mathbf{i}$ after $\mathbf{h}$ which is not in the orig. 3 only the lowest stroke of $\mathbf{S}$ is left, and niir is very faint indeed; $\mathbf{n}$ might be $\mathbf{m} ; \mathbf{k}$ might be $\mathbf{g}$. ( $f$ ) 1 above the second 1 is a hasta left of the previous line. 2 only the tips of the arms of $\underline{V}$ remain. 4 von P. omits is and the $\underline{n}$ or $\underline{m}$ before iir. $\quad 5$ a vertical is left before iis. 6 von P. gives pape, but $e$ is doubtful $(\vdash)$. 8 letter before $\mathbf{f}$ (von P. u.) uncertain, only J . von P.'s $\mathbf{h}$ ad fin. after $\mathbf{s}$ is faint and uncertain. 10 last $\mathbf{f a i n t}$ but certain. $\quad 11 \mathbf{n}$ is $H$, possibly $l i$, the rest is clear except the first $s$. 12 von P. gives upidka, but llas seemed quite clear to me, and I have little doubt of the $\underline{u}$, though only its upper half is left. What seemed at first to be a vertical before the top angle of the $\mathbf{S}$ (von P.'s $\mathbf{k}$ ) is really only a dint in the lead.

I am bound to add that, although with the help of an excellent lens I have made a few corrections in von Planta's text, yet I am deeply indebted to the accuracy with which he for the first time deciphered these difficult fragments.

Von Planta, l.c.

138 Painted underneath the handle of a large Campanian vase of second-rate workmanship, formerly apud Braun at Rome; Momm. U. D. xii. $32 b$, whence Zvet. Osc. xviii. 4. The first line can only just be read in the curve of the handle. The letters are somewhat archaic, and all the cross strokes slant downwards.

## pupdiis | stenis

U. D. p. 189, Zvet. Osc. 136, Fabr. 2841.

On a black earthenware goblet, formerly in the collection of Oraz. Pascale at Curti, now lost. Fiorelli, Giorn. Scav. Pomp. 1850, p. xii. not. 20, whence Zvet. Osc. 139, Fabr. 2839.

140 Now in the Naples Museum, where I saw it in March 1894; Fiorelli Mon. Epigr. Pomp. x. 3, whence Zvet. Osc. xviii. 3.

## (a) heiren | upsed

Scratched on $\leq$ large tile in Osc. $\alpha \beta$, the letters irregular, about 2 in . ( 05 m .) in height, $\mathfrak{u}$ is $Y$; after the $\mathbf{n}$ there is $\Sigma$, but the other letters run from right to left, and it' is so much fainter than the rest, that I doubt if it was really written at the same time.

Zvet. Osc. 135, Fabr. 2818.
(b) Further along the tile at some little distance are three or four other symbols, very much smaller than those of (a); all of them (except the first) must have been cut by a different instrument from that used to write (a), and one that had two points;

$$
\text { Nな? } 9 \Sigma 3 \text { ? ssrssn }
$$

commonly read frus, but clearly only random letters.

141 On two sides of a fragment of bronze plate about 1 in . square ( .027 by $\cdot 03 \mathrm{~m}$.), now in the Naples Museum, where I saw it in 1894; facsim. from de Petra, Zvet. Osc. xviii. 7. The letters on one side measure $\frac{3}{5}$ in., on the other $\frac{1}{5}$ $(\cdot 015,005 \mathrm{~m}$.$) ; Osc. a \beta$, regularly cut, the cross strokes horizontal, and the interpuncts in (b) single. Zvet. read the first letter of $(b) 2$ as g , but $\mathfrak{u}$ is quite clear, the last i is on the edge.

## a. ma <br> b. t statiis | ${ }^{\circ}$ helevii

There is a line of marks above (b), but it seems to be simply a succession of ornaments.

Zvet. Osc. 140.

Note xiil. Formerly at Paris in the Pourtalès collection, now in the British Museum, Vase no. 1445; Mommsen, U. D. p. 189, and Zvet. Osc. xviii. 6, both from Panofka, Antiques du Cabinet Pourtalès ix. (Paris, 1834).

## santia

In Osc. a $\beta$ (but in what language?) on a vase of S. Italian workmanship (' probably from Nola,' Mommsen, and Braun), over a stout, bald-headed figure in a comic dress, holding up the first two fingers of the right hand in pedantic fashion and grasping a knotty stick in his left. On his right is a two-handled dish, on his left a small altar, on which stands a youthful Hercules leaning on his club. No doubt the figure is the Aristophanic Xanthias, but in what situation? The name $\xi$ avelas appears similarly of an actor in a comic scene on another vase, Heydemann, Arch. Jahrb. r. 273.
U. D. p. 189, Zvet. Osc. 138, Fabr. 2840.

## Note xiv. Leaden fragments at Naples.

(1) On a broken slip of lead plate ( .029 m . by $\cdot 014$ ) rounded at one end and pierced with a hole, bought from a Neapolitan dealer and presented by Zvetaieff to the Naples Museum, where I saw it in April 1894. Zvet. Osc. p. 153 (addendum to p .75 ) : Osc. $\alpha \beta$. If it be genuine the shape suggests that it was - label of some kind, ef. 193-4 inf.
arnn.
(2) On an irregular bit of lead, broken all round, about $\cdot 05 \mathrm{~m}$. by $\cdot 04$, with - clear space to the left of the letters but no straight margin. I saw it in the Naples Museum.

$$
\underline{d}(? g) \text { is fr } \mid \text { verna } \mid \text { helv } \mid \text { helv | INOH. }
$$

In Osc. $\alpha \beta$ from right to left. Of the first letter only the lower tail is left, and about as much of $a$ in $1.2 ; \underline{e}$ in 1.4 is curious, consisting merely of the upper part of that letter, like a small $v$, exactly half the size of the letters on either side of it. If the insc. is genuine (and no doubt even if not!) we may compare with the figures in the last line (which Mom. read igni), $\vdash=1$ drachma on a Greek vase insc. from Suessula (Bull. Ins. Arch. Rom. 1878, p. 149), and often on Attic vases, e.g. ' $\tau \mu \boldsymbol{\eta}$ : $H$,' ' price 1 drachma 1 obol,' on the foot of a wine-vessel, now at Vienna, Kretschmer Gr. Vaseninschrr. p. 2. Possibly also Note x. sup. p. 83.

Zvet. Osc. 141, U. D. p. 184, tab. x. 27.

## 142-152. CAMPANIAN COINS.

See generally Head, Historia Numorum, pp. 25-36; Mommsen-Blacas, Histoire de la Monnaie Romaine, pp. 159-168, 319-328; Poole, Catalogue of Greek Coins in the British Museum 1. pp. 72-129, Friedländer, Oskische Münzen pp. 1-40, and now Dressel's Beschreibung der Antiken Münzen der Königlichen Museen zu Berlin (Berlin, 1894), Bd. iii. Abth. 1, Italien pp. 70-165.
a. urina
c. orina
b. urinai
d. urena

To the list must be added the Greek forms hurietes, vpavos. The confusion and alternation of alphabets which these legends show can only be represented by giving a list of the chief varieties of spelling, in their chronological order as fixed by the types and general style of the coins, which are very fully described by Imhoof-Blumer, Numism. Zeitschr. (Vienna) 1886 p. 206 ff., a reference I owe to Mr B. V. Head.
(1) HVDIETES
(2) AMIJV
(3) AMIGY
(4) NMIオY
(5) YPIANOS
(6) YDINAI
(7) AWEaY
(9) AhIaY
(8) YPINA (also with Y)
(10) אMIaY

It will be seen that the Greek influence is strongest in no. (1) (where it has decided the form of the name and the direction of the writing but not its $\alpha \beta$ ) and in no. 5 (where it has changed that also), but both times it gradually gives way to pure Oscan fashions, except for the $Y$. The $Y$ is remarkable beside the $v$ (not o nor $o v$ ) of the Greek forms (5) and (8) ; it does however denote $\mathbf{u}$ in 178 inf .

The Oscan forms are clearly abbreviations (say, for *urinaizom).
The coins are all silver didrachms, dating from about 420-350 в.с.

The types are as follows;
(i) Head of Pallas, helmeted $)$ (Campanian human-faced bull, butting ( 1 and 2 supr.).
(ii) Woman's head with broad fillet )(Camp. bull, standing ${ }^{1}$ (3).
(iii) Head of Pallas helmeted, with $\left.\Gamma^{\mathbb{1}}\right)(, \quad$, " (4-7).
(iv) Head of Hera adorned ) (Camp. bull, standing (some specimens of 5 , and $8-10$ ).

Now the obverse types (i) and (ii) are those of the two earliest series of the coins of Nola, and this parallelism, together with the absence of the $\Gamma$ and (iv) from Nola, shows (1) that Hyria cannot have been its palaeopolis (as Friedländer and others have supposed), but nevertheless (2) that the two towns cannot have been far apart. Imhoof-Blumer has most ingeniously identified Hyria with 'Fenseris,' for which see below.
I.-Blumer l. c., Friedl. O. M. p. 37, U. D. p. 201, Beschreib. Berl. p. 98, Head p. 32, Poole p. 91, Zvet. Osc. 180. A second example of (d) was found by Dressel near Alife, see Hist. u. philol. Aufsütze Ernst Curtius gewidmet, Berlin 1884, p. 250.

## 143

'Fenserni' (Lat. Veseris?).
a. $\langle\in \nu \sigma \in \rho$ (Ion. $a \beta$ left to right).
b. fensernu (Osc. aß, retrograde).

The reading $\Sigma \epsilon \nu \sigma \epsilon \rho$ is nowhere correct: apart from the legend the coins are identical in all respects, namely, silver didrachms, with a head of Hera, adorned )(Bellerophon on Pegasus fighting Chimaera. The obverse type is the same as that of the latest coins of Hyria (supra), and in a number of the specimens of both the Hyrian and Fenserine coins ImhoofBlumer (Numism. Zeitschr. Vienna, 1886 p. 211 ff) has recognised traces (1) of a split in the die and, in another set of each, (2) of the same split smoothed over to the injury of the pattern. Hence he concludes that the same die was used in both series, that is, that the towns are identical.

[^33]Sometime, then, about the middle of the 4th century b.c. the Greek or Grecising Hyria became the pure Oscan 'Fenseris' (ethnicon Fenserno-).

The use of $\langle$ for $\mathbf{f}$ in Ion. $a \beta$, which the identity of the types places beyond a doubt, throws a most welcome light on the two Bruttian helmet inscc. supr. no. 6 and 7.

The comparison of fensernu with Lat. Veseris was made long ago by Millingen, and supported by the Duc de Luynes (Ann. Inst. Arch. Rom. 1830 p. 308)." Livy (8. 8) gives the site of the battle as haud procul radicibus Vesuvii montis qua via ad Veserim ferebat, and Vesuvius is close to Nola, a fact that favours the identification of Veseris with the city of the Fenserines, which we know from its coins to have been once called Hyria, and, from its earlier coins, to be somewhere near Nola. Further there is a small village 6 miles from Nola called Pernosano (see letter of the 'archiv-director' of Naples quoted Num. Zeitschr. 1886 p. 218) which it is just possible to regard as a barbarised form of *Fensernanum. Veseris therefore would stand for *Fenseris. But is there any explanation to be given of the quite irregular relation between Lat. $\mathbf{v}$ - and Osc. f -? Unless and until there is, the Fenserines cannot be allowed to make their home in Veseris. For a possible solution see Conway, Camb. Philolog. Soc. Transactions III. p. 227.

One or both of the two coins are mentioned also by Poole p. 127 f., Garrucci, Monete d. Italia Antica p. 93, Friedl. O. M. p. 64 (from Millingen, Ancient Coins p. 27), Beschr: Berl. p. 102.

Note xv. Friedl. O8k. M. p. 66 quotes a silver coin with a doubtful legend (?) which Fiorelli (Osservazioni sopra Monete rare, Naples, 1843, p. 3) read fe- in Osc. aß. Friedl. does not pronounce upon it himself, the more so that its types (head of Apollo, and a galloping horseman) appear on a coin of Naples. If Fiorelli's reading was right, it may naturally be referred to 'Fenseris.'

## a. nuvkirinum ala....num

## b. nuvkrinum alafaternum )(degvinum ra.....nnnum

c. nuvirkum alaftern..
d. nuvirkum alavfnum
e. arasne? (only one coin, Fried.).

Osc. $u \beta$ (retrogr.) with $\mathcal{e}, I \mathrm{v}$, and $T \mathrm{t}$ in some of the specimens of $(c)$ and $(d)$, but in $(a)$ and $(b)$ always $\exists$ and $\sqsupset(7)$, cf. p. 107 f. sup. In some of the examples of $(b)$ we have $\diamond, B, C, O$ for $f$ as well as 8,8 , and in some exx. at Berlin the U's are dotted. The last word of the rev. seemed to me to be ra]valnnum on one Brit. Museum specimen; the last four letters are certain, and the ra from other coins. In one Brit. Museum example of (c) $\mathbf{f}$ is $\uparrow$ clearly, and may be in a second. In $(d) \mathbf{f}$ is clearly $\boldsymbol{\delta}^{\circ}$ in two Brit. Museum specimens and in one at Berlin. (e) is Mommsen's reading of an obscure legend on the reverse of one specimen of (b).

Silver except (b), some of which are bronze : for types see Poole p. 121, Head p. 34. Date 308-269 в.c. Zvet. Osc. 179, Momms. U. D. p. 200, Friedl. O. M. p. 21 f., Beschreib. Berl. p. 152.

Naples.
a. $\nu \in O . . \lambda \ldots .).($ makkiis .akd...m

## b. au....im maakkiis <br> c. a......m makdiis (?)

(a) has been recently discovered and cut the knot of the historical and phonetic difficulties which arose from reading (b) and (c) as 'aurunkud' (cf. Verner's Law in Italy, p. 50); it is given as read by Dressel and Sallet at Berlin in Zeitschr. f. Numismatik xv. p. 35 (a reference I owe to Mr B. V. Head), cf. Beschreib. Berl. p. 118.

All three coins have the same types, Apollo-head ) dolphin, and $\nu \in 0(\pi 0) \lambda(\iota \tau \omega \nu)$, the insc. of ( $\alpha$ ), leaves no doubt as to their origin; the words on the reverse must be names of magistrates, and what the one beginning with a may be is absolutely uncertain. (c) is in the Brit. Museum and 'hardly anything but the a can be safely read' (Head)'; in (b) and (c) Garrucci, Monete d. Ital. Antica p. 78 tab. 83, 2-4, gives aurunkim and aurunkm, but as he writes equally confidently of them both, it is difficult to trust him for either. The Berlin reading is far more likely to be the true one. In (c) $\mathbf{d}$ is a slip of the engraver's for $\mathbf{k}(X$ for $\rangle \mid$ ).
'Their date is about 300 b.c., rather later than earlier' (Head). With this Samnite name in Naples cf. Stra. 5. 4. 7 vorrepov $\delta \dot{\epsilon}$ (i.e. after the


${ }^{1}$ Sept. 19, 1892.



With makkiis Garr．compares Maccius on a Lat．insc．from Pompeii （Not．Scav． 1881 p．324）．The references for＇aurunkud＇are Poole p．75， Zvet．Osc． 172.

| a．$\kappa \alpha \mu \pi \alpha \nu о \mu$（retrog．） | c．$\kappa \alpha \mu \pi \alpha \nu о$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| b．$h \alpha \mu \pi \alpha \nu о \mu$（retrog．） | d．$\kappa \alpha \pi \pi \alpha \nu o ~$ |

These legends are given as generally read（by Friedländer，Mommsen etc．）．The $-\mu$ of（a）and（b）is $M$ between the legs of the bull，the other letters running horizontally above it，and is read as－s by Imhoof－Blumer （Num．Zeitschr． 1886 pp．223，226），while（c）and（d）he regards as incom－ plete．The Greek legend канта⿱亠䒑ov has its－$\nu$ out of line but not nearly so far off；калтavos also occurs in one line．（b）is simply a miswriting， probably due to the compound letter $1 A$ used in some of the examples of


Silver didrachms of the regular Campanian standard with
（1）Beardless head
（2）Head of Pallas in wreathed helmet $\}$ ）$\left\{\begin{array}{l}\text { Campanian bull，with } \\ \text { varying symbols．}\end{array}\right.$
They were referred to Capua by Mommsen and the Duc de Blacas （Monn．Rom．I．p． 162 n．），but Imhoof－Blumer（Numism．Zeitschr． 1886 p． 222 ff ．）maintains the older view of Friedländer（ $O . M$. p． 33 f．）that they were coined at Naples，because there are coins with the legend $\nu \epsilon \sigma \pi \sigma \lambda \iota$ which have not merely exactly the same type as the second series of Campanian coins，but share with them certain peculiarities（which he does not describe）proving，he thinks，that they were struck from the same die． That this is possible historically appears from Stra．5．4．7，quoted in the note to 145.

Type（2）is that of the earliest series of Neapolitan coins dating from 420－400 в．c．（Head p．32），with which the Campanian coins may be contemporaneous even if Imhoof－Blumer＇s conclusion be unsound，and must be either contemporaneous or earlier if it be correct．If the coins are from Capua，they must at least be older than 340 b．c．，v． 148.

Momm．U．D．pp．104，202，Monn．Rom．I．pp．162，327，Friedl．O．M．p． 33，Head p．27，Poole p． 72 f．，Beschr．Berl．p． 70.

Note xvi．On the coin legends ending in－NO．Some difficulty has been felt with regard to these forms ；Mommsen（U．D．p． 204 n ．）was at first inclined to treat them all as Latin genitives plural，but this cannot be true of those in Greek $a \beta$ ，like $\Gamma A I \Sigma T A N O K A \Gamma \Gamma A N O$ ．

I have little hesitation in regarding them as Oscan with -O for -uim (i.e. -om), at all events when they are written in Gr. or Osc. letters, or show other Oscan characteristics as the $\mathbf{i}$ of TIANO (pure Lat. Tean-). But those in Lat. $\alpha \beta$ (Aisernino Head p. 24, Caiatino id. p. 27, Caleno ib., Cosano id. p. 25, Romano (from Capua) id. p. 28, Suesano id. p. 35) may as well be Latin as Oscan in point of form, while Aquino and Corano (id. p. 23) from a Volscian and a Latin town respectively, must, I think, be Latin, see the note tn 252 inf . I have not therefore counted any legends of this class as Oscan ${ }^{1}$.

Both Oscan and Latin forms are, on the whole, best regarded as acc. sing. masc., (nummum) vides being understood, as with Volcanom (185, infr.), propom (159); it is conceivable that this may have been simply taken from the Gr. coin legends like ' $\mathrm{P} \eta \gamma \bar{\nu} \nu \boldsymbol{\nu} \nu(\nu o ́ \mu \nu \sigma \mu a$ ) read as acc. instead of nomin. Mommsen (U. D. p. 204 n., C. I. L. I. p. 9) thought they were gen. pl., holding that $-m$ was only dropped in writing after long vowels (between 350-150 в.c.), but this cannot be independently established, whereas if the Oscan forms were gen. pl., we should expect-num, not -nům (kupelternům), since - $\bar{o}$ - became $-\bar{u}$ - in Oscan, written $u^{2}$, see Buck, Osk. Vocalism. p. 133; - $\boldsymbol{\nu}$ in Gr. aß is ambiguous, of. no. 5 supr. The forms in -nim also, memnim (131), aesernim (185), safinim (169), are much more easily explained as acc. sing., cf. Buck ib. p. 61. The Latin coins however need not necessarily follow the same usage; and in C. I. L. r. 16 the appearance of $\nu \epsilon 0 \pi \circ \lambda \iota \tau \omega \nu$ and suesano on the same coin makes Mommsen's view plausible for the Latin forms (though not certain, cf. no. $184 e$ infra).

The view that the Latin -no forms stand for -nos would separate them still further from the Oscan, since Old Lat. Campanos=Osc. Campans3; but it is unlikely that a merely occasional and somewhat ambiguous form of the Latin nom. sing. masc. should have attained to such general
${ }^{1}$ The legends PECINO (retrograde) and MESSANO, wh. Mommsen (U. D. p. 104 n.) could only call 'jedenfalls griechische Formen,' cannot be that, and are probably mere misreadings, or damaged, if they are genuine. I can only find the first, in Mionnet (Méd. Antiques, I. p. 200, no. 955, but omitted in his list of weights), and neither is mentioned in Mommsen's Monnaie Romaine. Lest anyone should wish to regard them as Oscan forms, let me add (1) that Regium was only in Oscan hands from 280-271 b.c., whereas the Chalcidian C had disappeared from its coins by 415 b.c. (Head, p. 93 f.), and (2) that the Mamertines of Messana used only their own name on their coins, not that of the town (Head, p. 136).

- Except in late Oscan, as on the Cippus Abellanus, where the $-\mathrm{u}^{-}$- spelling is usual in long-vowel-cases from $o$ - stems. Buck is clearly right in regarding this as a semi-pedantic spelling, which has no bearing on the pronunciation; but this can hardly have come in by 268 в.c.
${ }^{1}$ Plaut. Trin. 2. 4. 144.
use over so wide an area; v. Stolz Lat. Gram. in I. Müller's Handb. ${ }^{2}$ § 69. It should perhaps be added that they cannot, of course, be ablatives, since the final $-d$ was not completely lost in Latin till 178 B.c. (Stolz ib.).

| $147-$ | 147 Atella. | 147 bis. | Calatia. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | a. ade (retrog.) |  | kala (left to right) |
|  | b. aderl (retrog.) |  | kalat (retrog.) |
|  |  |  | kalati (retrog.) |

Bronze coins only, Osc. $a \beta$ finely formed; for types etc. v. Head p. 26 f., Poole p. 74 f., Beschr. Berl. p. 74; these two towns were probably dependent on Capua (pp. 99 f. and below) whose fate they shared; date 250211 b.c. (Head). In 147 e is always $\exists$, except one coin with $\exists$; in 147 bis (b) $t$ is $T$ and $T$, in (c) it is $T$.

Friedl. pp. 15, 19, Momms. U. D. p. 201. Zvet. Osc. 176.

148 Cариа (see p. 99 sup.).
From 338-318 в.c. we have silver coins with romano, from 318-268 в.c. with roma, from 268-211 some with roma but others of bronze with

## kapv

in Osc. aß retrogr., which also occurs on silver coins probably dating from 216-211, i.e. during the Capuan revolt in the Hannibalic war.

For types etc. v. Head p. 28 ff., Poole p. 80 ff., Beschr. Berl. p. 82.
$\nabla$ is regularly $]$, rarely ], and $p$ is $\Pi$, rarely $\Gamma$.
For the coins of the Campani ( $\kappa a \mu \pi a \nu o$ etc.) commonly attributed to Capua see 146 supra.

Momm. U. D. p. 104, 112, 200, Monnaie Rom. I. p. 263, Friedl. O. M. p. 7, Zvet. Osc. 175.

## a. kupelternum <br> b. kupelternům

Only bronze coins 300-268 в.c. Type: head of Apollo )( Campan. bull crowned by Nike. e and $t$ are rectangular, $\mathbf{p}$ is $\mathbb{M}$. On rev. of (b) are the Gr. letters $\mid \Sigma$ as on contemporary coins of Naples, Aesernia, Cales, Suessa and Teanum. On the forms of the name v. Am. Journ. Phil. XI. p. 308 n., and infra 154 A. For the little that is known about the town see Liv. 23. 39 and 24. 20, with Mom. C. I. L. x. p. 449.
U. D. p. 200, Head p. 30, Poole p. 84. Friedl. O. M. p. 5, Zvet. Osc. 174.

## Teanum Sidicinum.

a. tianud ) (sidikinud (the insc. on the rev. is in some exx. from left to right)
b. tianud) (sidikinud (both insec. retrogr.)
a tianud
d. tiano
$(\alpha)-(c)$ in Osc. aß; the variation of direction in (a) is either a remnant of Greek influence or the first trace of Roman; most of the examples have $R=i$, some $F$, all have $T .(d)$ is in Lat. $a \beta$ and is only Oscan (if at all) in the $i$ of the first syllable (pure Lat. Teanum).
(a)-(c) are both in silver and bronze, from 300-268 B.c., (d) are all bronze and between 268 and 218 (C. I. L. x. p. 471), with the later type, Pallas-head )(cock. Latin therefore was spoken at Teanum by the end of the III. cent. b.c. The town had been admitted, with Capua, to passive Roman citizenship in 336 b.c. (C. I. L. l.c.). Strabo ( 5 p. 237) calls the
 (pre-Tuscan) inhabitants of Campania, see 153 A inf.
U. D. p. 200, Head p. 36, Poole p. 125, Friedl. O. M. p. 1, Zvet. Osc. 173, Beschr. Berl. p. 157.

## Note xvii. Venafrum?

a. enafrum?
b. feinaf?
c. enaf?

Doubtful legends in Osco-Latin aß, from Garrucci, Mon. Ital. Ant. p. 91; (a) is retrogr. with $\mathrm{Z}=r, \mathrm{~N}=a, \mathrm{H}=m$, but $\exists=f, \mathrm{~N}=n$ (not the pure

Osc. H); (b) is from left to right and begins and ends with F, according to Garrucci, who gives an engraving of a cast sent him from the University Museum, Glasgow ; but the Curator of this Museum, Prof. J. Young, writing Nov. 3, 1892, informed me that the coin could not then be identified, and that the whole collection was re-arranged by MM. Waddington and Svoronos in 1889, who may have read the legend otherwise, and referred it to a different town. Since then (Jan. 1895) Prof. Young has been able to send me impressions of the coin in which I can only read $\hat{\lambda}$. The ei would be very doubtful compared with the Latin Vernafrum. (a) was in Garr.'s own collection, ( $c$ ) in the Willenheim collection.

Bronze, with the regular Camp. types, (a) Apollo wreathed)( humanheaded bull, (b) and (c) head of Pallas )( cock crowing. (a) therefore would be between 290 and 268 в.c., (b) later than 268 B.c., cf. Head, p. 27 (Cales).

151, 152 Uncertain Campanian coins, Head p. 36, Poole p. 127, Beschr. Berl. p. 161.

151 'Velecha...' (?'Volcania').
a. $F \in$
b. $F \epsilon \lambda \epsilon$
c. $F \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \chi$
d. $F \in \lambda \in \chi a$

Bronze coins, all in Tar.-Ion. a $\beta$ from left to right; $(\alpha)$ is cast, the rest stamped. ( $a$ ) shows head of Helios radiate )( horse's head with:, the rest have a radiate bust instead of simply a head ) (an elephant, a type which appears also in the coins of Atella (Head p. 26, Friedl. Annal. Inst. Archacol. Rom. 1846 p. 150 tab. F). Two of them have been twice coined, one, after the 'Volcanian' stamp, by the Romans (ROM), the other, before it, by the Mamertines (MAME). (b), (c) and (d) cannot be earlier than the time of Pyrrhus, but $(\alpha)$ is older than the rest. The horse's head is a common type, re-appearing e.g. in the bronze coins of Tarentum (Poole p. 213) and the aes grave of Umbria (ib, p. 52).

The name is otherwise unknown in Italy, though it has an Etruscan sound, and it may be the older name of some Campanian town (cf. HyriaFenseris supr. 143). Garrucci, Mon. Ital. Ant. p. 90, compares [EへXANO\& $=$ Volcanus on the coins of Phaestus in Crete, and the Volcanom on the coins of Aesernia (infr. 185). From the : compared with the six puncts
used in several Sicilian towns to denote the half-as, and from the re-stamped Mamertine coin, Garrucci infers some connexion between this town and the Mamertini from Campania, who settled in Messana in 289 b.c. Mommsen Röm. Mzw. 335 concludes that this town like Atella and Calatia was subject to Capua, because none of their coins are higher than the triens, while the quincunx and dextans only come from Capua, of. Beloch Campanien ${ }^{2}$ p. 9 and 314.

The form Velecha is almost certainly an abbreviation, and the anaptyxis vouches for its Oscan character: the most probable equivalent in Latin would be such a form as * Volcania. It is hardly likely to be anything but the name of a town or tribe.

## щац८еS

Ion. $\alpha \beta$ left to right; bronze : type, female head with tasseled cap and earring )(Campan. bull, v. Glossary. 'It may be as early as 400 B.c. but cannot be earlier' (Head).

Note xviii. Bronze coins have been found in Pompei, Suessula, and according to Avellino (Opusc. 3. 110) in Sorrento, of the regular Camp. type (Apollo, and the human-headed bull) with the legends irnor, irnoi, irn日, Head, p. 36, Poole, p. 127, Garrucci, Mon. It. Ant. p. 97, in both directions, in Etruscan characters $(\mathrm{D}=r$, and $\oplus$, once $\mathrm{O},=\ominus)$. Garrucci states that there is astream near Salernum now called Irno, and would therefore place this town there [if town it be]. Mommsen (U. D. p. 313) classed the coins with the bowls from S. Agata dei Goti, near Nola, which have Etruscan inscc., v. p. 94 sup. Beloch Camp. ${ }^{2}$ p. 10 compares 'Aplv $\theta \eta, \pi \delta \lambda_{c s}$ Oiv $\omega \tau p l a s$, a fragment of Hekataeus, and finds this confirmed by Pliny 3. 70, who states that the ager Picentinus (which, like Olv $\omega$ rpla, ended at Cape Athenaeum) once belonged to the Etruscans. 'Their style seems later than that of the $\mu$ aucs-coins' (Head).

## 153. Campanian ${ }^{1}$ Glosses.

## A. Well attested.

Osci, Obsci, Opici the Italic, pre-Tuscan inhabitants of Campania.
This is the sense in which Strabo regularly uses the name "Orko (e.g. 5 , p. 247), and though he alludes to certain writers who distinguished "O 0 кoo and 'Otıcot he appears himself (p. 242) to identify the two. His use of the name "Ofrot seems to be based on the statement of Antiochus which he quotes (ibid.), that the Opici were the same people as the Ausones; though he notes that Polybius and others distinguished them. Aristotle (Pol. 4 [7]. 10 and apud Dion. Hal. Ant. Rom. 1. 72) agrees with Antiochus; and both extend the name 'Otukia to the whole of Italy north of Oenotria and Iapygia, excepting only the
 enumerates 'Отıкol as one of the Samnite tribes. Verg. Aen. 7. 723 ff . classes Osci along with Aurunci, Sidicini and the Samnites of Saticula. Similarly Paul. Fest. 136 M. (s.v. Maesius) Osci enim a regione Campaniae quae est Oscorum uocati sunt; Fest. 189 M. Obscum duas diuersas et contrarias significationes habet. Nam Cloatius putat eo uocabulo significari sacrum, quo etiam leges sacrae (-atae Müll.) obscatae (?) dicuntur. Et in omnibus fere antiquis commentariis scribitur Opicum pro Obsco, ut in Titinni fabula Quinto: Qui Obsce et Volsce fabulantur nam Latine nesciunt ${ }^{2}$. Also Fest. 198 M. Oscos quos dicimus ait Verrius Opscos antea dictos, teste Ennio, quom dicat: De muris rem gerit Opscus. Serv. ad Aen. 7. 730 gives Ophici as an old name of the 'Capuenses,' deriving it from of $\phi$ is! Similarly Hesych.


The Italiot Greeks who were in contact with the 'OT⿺𠃊ol naturally used the name to mean 'ignorant of Greek, barbarous.' Hence came its use, in silver Latin (e.g. Juv. 3. 206, 6. 454), in the sense 'rude, vulgar (in speech).' The earlier meaning appears clearly in two passages pointed out to me by Dr J. P. Postgate. Cato ap. Plin. 29, § 14, Nos quoque dictitant barbaros et spurcius nos quam alios opicos appellatione foedant. Similarly Lydus De Mens. 1. 13


Juno Populona, C. I. L. x. 4780, 4789, 4790, Mart. Cap. £, p. 38, Macr. Sat. 3. 11. Mom. U. D. p. 144 considers her specifically Oscan.
seculae, 'falces in Campania dictae a secando.' Varr. L. L. 5. 137.
${ }^{1}$ It is perhaps desirable to put together under a separate heading the words assigned to Campania by the authorities, but no doubt the great majority of those simply given as 'Oscan' (collected in 205 infra) were also in use in Campania.
${ }^{2}$ I suppress the absurd connexion with obscenus which at p. 198 M. Festus himself rightly rejects.
versus, vorsus, the Oscan unit of area, $=10,000$ Osean and 8640 Roman square feet.

Varr. R.R.1.10. In Campania rura metiuntur versibus....Versum dicunt C pedes quoquo versum quadratum.

Frontin. Limit. p. 30 Lachm. Agri modus plerumque centenum pedum in utraque parte, quod Graeci plethron appellant, Osci et Umbri vorsum.

Hygin. Condic. Agr. p. 121 Gud. Versus habet p. VIII DCXI, ita jugero sunt versus numero $\quad$ II $\left(=3 \frac{1}{3}\right)$.

On the Oscan foot see Hultsch Griech. und Rom. Metrol. ${ }^{2}$ p. 94, Nissen, Pomp. Stud. c. 3, p. 70 ff .; the latter shows that the statements of Hyginus are confirmed by the actual measurements of Pompeii.

## C. Doubtful.

"H $\beta \omega \nu$, gen. - $\omega \nu \circ$ s, 'Liber pater.'
Liberi patris simulacra partim puerili aetate partim iuuenis fingunt: praeterea barbata specie, senili quoque,...ut in Campania Neopolitani celebrant "H $\beta \omega \nu a$ cognominantes. Macrob. Sat. 1. 18.

The form is no doubt correct, and should perhaps be mentioned here, but it seems wholly Greek, though it might represent some similar Oscan name.

## 154. Place-names ${ }^{1}$ of Campania ${ }^{2}$.

A. Well attested (in form, date, and locality).

Campania cl. but not used by Lat. writers before Varro, cf. Capua inf. Sĭlărus, m. fl. cl. (-ler Luc. 2. 425, -apıs Strab.). Sele f. Picentia, -ntini cl. (settled there by the Romans 268 b.c.), cf. Strab. 5. 4. 13, Momms. C. I. L. x. p. 60. Vicénza; Vicentina f. Sălernum, -rnitanus cl. inscc. Salérno. [Sīrēnēs or Sīrēnūsae Insulae cl.]

[^34]Căprĕae insula, -reensis, -rineus cl. Cápri.
[Crātēr=sinus Cumanus cl.]
[Mineruae prom. cl.]
Surrentum, -entini cl. inscc. Sorrénto.
Nūcĕrĭa (Alfaterna), -rini (Alfaterni) cl. inscc.; cf. 144 sup. Nocéra dei Pagani.
Stăbĭae cl., -anus insc. Osc. Staf- 39 sup.
Scantia silva, -iae aquae, -iana mala cl.
Pompēii, -ēianus cl. inscc. See p. 54 sup.
Sarnus, m. fl. cl., Sarrastes populi Verg. A. 7. 737 al. Särmo f.
Vĕsŭuı̆us mons cl. (Vesuĭus (trisyll.) Val. F1., Sil., Martial, Věsēuus Stat., Val. Fl.).
ad Veserim, Liv. 8. 8, Cic. Off. 3.112 al. $?=$ Fensernu nm. 143 sup. ?? Pernosano.
Sēbēthus fl. cl. insc.
Herculānĕum (-кovááveov, -aкגeíov) cl. inscc., cf. Mom. C. I. L. x. p. 156.

Trĭfŏlīnus ager, -num uinum cl.
Gaurus mons, -anus cl. (Juno Gaura C. I. L. x. 3783).
[Pausǐlȳpus mons, cl. Posîllipo.]
[Palaepolis, -itanus Liv. e.g. 8. 22, Palaeop- Act. Capit. 336 b.c., but not known to any Greek authorities; hence identified by Mom. (C. I. L. x. p. 170) with Cumae.]
[Něāpŏlis, -litanus (Nєoro八írns always on coins) cl. inscc. Nápoli.]
[Parthĕnŏpé, another name for Palaepolis (cf. Beloch Camp. ${ }^{2}$ p. 440, C. I. L. x. p. 170) in cl. poetry $=$ Naples, e.g. Verg. G. 4. 564.]
 cf. p. 84 sup. Pozzúoli.
N ēsis, -idis insula (acc. -īda Luc. 6. 90) cl. Nisidd.
Mīsēnum prom. -sēnensis cl. (-enae two late inscc.). Miséno.
Lŭcrīnus lac. cl. insce.
Avernus lac., -nalis cl. insc. Avérno.
Bauli, -lanus cl. insec.
Baiae, -ianus cl.
[Acheron lac., -rusia palus (close to Baiae) cl.]
Cūmae (Kı́u ), -anus cl. inscc. (also -aeus cl.). Cuma (mediaer.).
Gallīnārǐa silva vel palus cl.
[Pithēcūssae insulae cl. i.e.

1. Prochy̆ta cl. Prócida.]
2. Aenẵrǐa cl. (Īnărımē Verg. Aen. 9. 715).

Pandateria,-aria insula cl. -ōtīra C. I. L. x. 6785 , where Mommsen gives other rarer forms. Ventoténe.
[Phlegraei campi ( $\left.\Phi \lambda \hat{\prime} \not{ }^{\prime} \rho \mathrm{\rho a}\right) \quad$ cl., cf. Leboriae B inf.]
Līternum, -erninus cl., Liternus fl. Liv. 32. 29, cf. C. I. L. x. p. 356.

Nōla, -lanus cl. inscc. (Osc. Nưvl-see p. 87 sup.). Nōla.
Ăbella, -llanus cl. inscc. (cf. ident.). Avella.
Ăcerrae, -rranus cl. (Ax-Strab. 3. 4. 8). Acérra.
$\bar{A} t e l l a,-1 l a n u s$ cl. insce. Osc. Aderl- 147 supra.
Suessula, -lanus cl. insce.
$\left\{\begin{array}{l}\text { Volturnus f., -nus, -nalis cl. insec. Voltúrno f. } \\ \text { Volturnum opp. cl. inscc. }\end{array}\right.$
Sāuō m. fl. cl. Savone f.
Cālātǐa (fem. sing.), -tinus cl., of. 147 bis supr., -tiae PL 3. 5. 63 and Tab. Peut. Galazze (Kiep.).
Tīfāta (neut. pl.), -tinus cl. inscc., cf. 205 B inf. and Curia Tifata at Rome, Paul. Fest. Müll. pp. 49 and 366.
Căpŭa, Campanus ${ }^{1}$ cl. inscc. (for the wider use of the ethnicon see Mom. C. I. L. x. p. 498; in Lat. writers Capuanus, -uensis are late, though they were invented by Polybius) ; S. Maria di Capua. (The name Capua was ultimately transferred to the remains of Casilinum, see p. 101 sup.)

Sēplăsĭa cl. inscc. (fem., rarely neut. pl.; -ăs- Auson. Epigr. 123. 4, -às- Marc. Emp. Carm. 66).
Căsĭlinum cl. insc., -linenses (Cic.), -nates (late). The name appears also to be applied to the river Volturnus, see Momms. C. I. L. x. p. 369 footn.

[^35]Caiatia, -tinus cl. insce. Cajazzo.
Trebula, -lanus cl. (Tpıßó̀a, T $\rho \dot{\prime} \beta o v \lambda a)$, -lani Ballinienses Pl. 3. 9. 11. Treglia (mediaeval Treple, Dict. Corog.).
Ager Stellās cl.
[Forum Popillii, Foropopillienses cl. insce.]
Fălernus ager, mons cl. (cf. ? 106-7 supr.), Falerna tribus cl. insc. cf. Liv. 9. 20.
Călēs f. (usually plur., both sing. and plur. Sil. It., sing. Tab. Peut.), -lēnus cl. insec.; down to 336 b.c. (Liv. 8. 16) a town of the Ausones. Calvi.
Compulteria Liv. 24. 20, cf. 149 sup., later Comb-, Cub- ${ }^{1}$, both cl. inscc., -ernus insc., -erinus cl. inscc., cf. Am. Journ. Phil. xi. p. 309 n. S. M. di Cuvultere (Kiep.).

Teanum Sidicinum, -anenses -cini cl. inscc., cf. 150 sup. Teano.
Vĕnafrum, -ranus cl. inscc., cf. p. 146 supr. Venafro.
Rufrae, -ranus cl. insc., ef. Rufrium Liv. 8. 25, and Fundus Rufrianus C. I. L. ix. 1455. 2. 8.

Add also
Mamertini ('a Campanis orti') cl. cf. notes to $1-3$ sup.

## B. Less certain.

Vici in Puteoli :
Calpurnianus and Vestorianus C. I. L. x. 1631.
Spurianusib. x. 3750.
Lartidianus Notiz. Scav. 1890, p. 17.
Also regio Palatina C. I. L. x. 1700, regio Thermensium ib. x. 1680.
[Euploea insula near Naples, Statius.]

[^36]Pagi in Nola:
Agrifanus C. I. L. x. 1278.
Capriculanus ib. 1279.
Lanita ib. 1280.
Also Laurinienses Augusti cultores, ib. 1238.
Pagi near Capua:
Herculaneus ib. 3772. Dianae Tifatinae ib. p. 367, also Dianensis uia ib. 3913.
[Urbana colonia n. of Casilinum, Itinn.]
Hamae near Capua Liv. 23. 35 ter ('ubi statum sacrificium omnibus Campanis').
Vicus Nouanensis, in Suessula, C. I. L. x. 3764.
*Hyria, -ianus, - $\epsilon \in \tau \rho,-\iota \nu a \ldots$ nm. 142 supr.
Clănı̆us f. Verg. G. 2. 225 al. Lagno f. (Kiep.).
Lactarius mons, late cl. e.g. Proc. B. G. 4. 35-6. Lettere.
Compiti regio, in Tifatis C. I. L. x. 3857.
Herculis petra, near Stabiae, Plin. 32 § 17, Salinae Herculeae, Colum. 10. 135.
Leboriae Pl. 18 § $111=$ Phlegraei campi (A sup.), cf. cogn. Leborianus 155 C ; also Leburini campi Pl. 3 § 60, which he neither identifies with nor clearly distinguishes from the Phlegraei.

## C. Doubtful.

Callicula mons, Liv. 22. 15 and 16.

Пирıф $\lambda_{\epsilon} \epsilon \in \theta \omega \nu$ fl. Stra. 1. 2. 18.
Aequāna n. pl. Sil. 5. 464.
Caulina uina, from near Capua, Plin. 14 § 69.
Hydrentini ? v. Momms. ad C.I. L. x. 1795.
Cornetus campus on the Via Campana, Vitruv. 8. 3. 17.

Cimmerium oppidum quondam Plin. 3. 5. 61, -m erii Paul. Fest. 43 Müll.
Megaris insula Plin. 3. 6. 82, Mĕgāľa Stat. Silv. 2. 2. 80.
Austicula ? Liv. 23. 39. 6, v. Momms. C. I. L. Ix. p. 196.
Isacia? Plin. 3. 7. 85 compared with 81. It cannot=mod. Ischia, since that name appears for the first time in a letter of Leo III 813 A.D. (Beloch, Camp. ${ }^{2}$ p. 206), and in the form Iscla. The ancient name was of course Aenaria (v. supr. A).
Taurubulae Stat. Silv. 3. 1. 128, apparently an island near Capreae or a part of Capreae itself.
Stătĭnae renatae?=fontes in Aenaria Stat. Silv. 3. 104.
[Ad Rotas Tab. Peut., An. Rav. 4. 33.]
$\Phi a \lambda \eta$ 白 ou $\tau \dot{\prime} \rho \sigma \iota \varsigma$ Lycophr. Alexand. 717, Steph. Byz. s.v., cf. ? Falernus A sup.
Eleutiana Tab. Peut.
Moera 'a Moerano rege condita,' the older name of Abella, Serv. ad Aen. 7. 740.

Bătŭlum, Verg. Aen. 7. 739, Sil. 8. 564.
Rufri maceria in Nola, Cato R. R. 22 and 135.
Cĕlemna (or -enna ?) Verg. Aen. 7. 739 and Serv. ad loc. Cf. praerupta Celennia Ovid Met. 15. 704 Heinsius, also ecclesia Celeniensis (?) in Synodo Romana anno 501.
Doliolum near Cumae, Serv. ad Aen. 6. 238.

Velecha-? nm. v. 151 supr.
$\Delta a$ úvıo८ near Nola? Polyb. 3. 91. 5.
Sabatini, mentioned with Atellani and Calatini as dependents of Capua Liv. 26. 33-4, must have dwelt near Capua, not, as Weissenb. thought, on the Sabatus in Hirpinis.
Mons Epomeus ? Tim. ap. Strab. 5, p. 248, Epopus Plin. 2. 89. 203, in Aenaria.

Plin. 3. 5. 63-4 gives further
D. Further modern names.

| Amalf, | Zuni, | Briano, | Afragola, |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Pozzilli, | Nocelleto, | Curti, | Rocca Rainola, |
| Rocca Pipirozzi, | Alvignano, | Recale, | Trocchia, |
| Presenzano, | Treglia, | Capodrise, | Pollena, |
| Mignano, | Carinola, | Arienzo, | Resina, |
| Cascano, | Arnone, | Casapesenno, | Atripalda, |
| Visciano, | Limatola, | Grumo, | Meta. |

155 Personal names ${ }^{1}$ of Campania ${ }^{2}$.
A. Frequent.

1. Nomina.

| gensAcilia | Appia | Bennia (Benia) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Acutia | Appuleia (Apu-) | Blossia sup. |
| Aelia | Aquilia (-illia) | Brinnia |
| Agria | Arria $g, l$ | Brittia (Bruttia, |
| Albia | Arruntia (Aru-) | rarely Briti-) |
| Albucia | Artoria | Caecilia |
| Alfena | Asinia | Caesellia (once -elia) |
| Alfia | Ateia | Caesia |
| Alleia (once Ale-) | Atilia | Caesonia |
| $\overline{\text { Allia }}$ | Attia | Calatoria |
| Ammonia (Hamm-, | Aufidia | Calpurnia |
| Amo-) | Aufustia | Caluentia (-uet-) |
| Amullia (-ulia) | Auiania | Caluia (Calau-) sup. |
| Anicia (Anec-? once) | Auillia | Caluisia (Calb-) |
| Annia (once Ani-) g, 7 | Aulena | Cania (Ka-) |
| Ansia | Aulia | Caninia (Ka-) |
| Antistia (-test-) $g, l$ | Aurelia $g, l$ (nom. | Caprasia |
| Antonia | masc. once - $\lambda$ (s) | Carisia |
| Aponia (once App-) | Baebia | Carulia (-ull-?) |

${ }^{1}$ For the arrangement and notation see the List of Signs and Abbreviations.
${ }^{2}$ From C. I. L. x. 508-4733, 4779-5043, 6786-6810, 8042, 8047-9, 8052, $8054-5,8058,8060,8065-7,8069,8071,8119-8237,8331,8335,8338,8343-$ 8381, and Kaibel Inscc. Gr. Sic. It. 694-902, 2409, and pp. 689-693.

| Casellia | Flauia $g, l$, passim | Magia |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Cassia(oneinsc.Casia) | Freia | Maia (once Mea) sup. |
| Castricia g, $l$ sup. | Fuficia | as praen. |
| Cattia (Catia) | Fuluia $g, l$ | Mammia (Mamia) |
| Ceia | Furia (once Furria) ${ }^{1}$ | Manlia (Manil-) |
| Cerrinia (once Ceri-) | Gabinia | Marcia $g, l$ |
| Cipia sup. | Gauia sup. | Maria g, $l$ |
| Claudia passim | Gellia | Melissaea sup. |
| Clodia | Grania | $\underline{\text { Memmia (once Me- }}$ |
| Cluuia | Heluia | mia) |
| Cocceia g, l (- $\eta$ los, once -aeus) | Herennia <br> Heria (once Herr-) | Messia (once -ea) <br> Mettia (once Maetia, |
| Coelia | Histria | once ? Metia) inf. |
| Cominia g, l inf. | Holconia | Minatia sup. |
| Cornelia | Hordionia (less often | Mindia |
| Cornificia | Horde-, one insc. | $\{$ Minicia |
| Cossinia | Horti-, once Hor- | Minucia |
| Cottia inf. | don-) | Munatia |
| Culcia (once Culg., | Hostia | Munnia (also Munia) |
| once Culch-) | Hostilia | Naeuia (once Neuia; |
| Curtia | Istacidia | also Neia) |
| Cuspia | Iulia $g, l$, passim (one | Nasennia sup. |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Deccia (Decia) sup. as } \\ & \text { praen. } \end{aligned}$ | insc. 'Io入ıos) <br> Iuniag $g$ (once? Iunn-) | Nemonia <br> Neria |
| Decidia | Laberia | Nigidia |
| Decimia (-cum-) | Laecania | Ninnia |
| Dinnia | Laelia | Nonia (once Nonnia) |
| Domitia | Larcia | inf. |
| Ducenia |  | Nouia $g$, $l$, sup. |
| Egnatia | Liuia | Numisia (once -mes-, |
| Ennia | Lollia $g$, $l$ | once -ms-, once |
| Epidia sup. | Longinia | -mps., inf.) |
| Equitia | Lucceia (once beside | Numitoria |
| Erucia (once Her-) | Avkıos C.I. L. 8047. | Octauia $g, l$, cf. sup. |
| Fabia $g$, $l$ | 10, once Luceia) | Ofillia (also -ilia) |
| Fabricia | Lucia (Luccia) | Olia (once Ollia) |
| Fadia | Lucilia | Oppia sup. |
| Faenia | Lucretia | Ouia |
| Fannia (Fania) $g, l$ | Lusius (once $\Lambda$ otocos ${ }^{2}$ ) | Paccia g, $l$ (aiso Pacia, |
| Firmia | Maecia (once Mai-, | once Paacia, cf. |
| Fisia | once $\mathrm{Me}-$ ) | Paquia, B inf.) |

${ }^{1}$ But Fusius C. I. L. x. 7854 (Sardinia), and Fourio ib. 6838, on a milestone of the uia Appia, dating from 249 в.c.
${ }^{2}$ Insc. of $166-157$ в.c., see C. I. L. x. p. 999.

| Pacideia | Samellia | Tillia |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Paconia | Satria | Titia (Tittia) $g, l$ |
| Pactumeia | Satrinia | Titinia |
| Papia sup. | Sattia | Trebia (once Trae-) |
| Papiria | Saufeia sup.? | sup. |
| Patulcia | Scentia | Tullia |
| Pauillia | Seia | Turrania |
| Pescennia | Sempronia | Valeria |
| Petronia | Sentia | Varenia (-ena) |
| Pinaria | Septimia (-tum-) | Varia |
| Plautia | Sergia $g$, $l$ | Vedia (Veid-) |
| Plotia $g, l$ | Seruilia | Veia |
| Plutia | Sestia | Velleia |
| Pollia (once Polia) | Seuia (once Sae-) | Venafrania |
| Pompeia $g, l$ | Sextia (-xst-) | Verania |
| Pomponia | Sextilia (-xst-) | Veratia |
| Pontia | Silia (Sillia, $\Sigma \in \epsilon \lambda-$ ) $g, l$, | Verria |
| Popidia sup. | sup. | Vesonia |
| Popilia (also -illia) | Sittia | $\overline{\text { Vettia }}$ (Vetia) |
| Poppaea $g$, $l$ | Sornia | Veturia |
| Porcia $g, l$ | $\underline{\text { Sossia (Sosia) }}$ | Vibia (Vibbia, Oû́lı $\beta$-) |
| Postumia | Spania (one inse.) | $g$, $\ell$, sup. |
| Proculeia | Spedia inf. | Vibria |
| Publicia (rarely Pob-) | Staia inf. | Vibuleia |
| Publilia | Statia $g$, l, inf. | Viciria (Vicria, once |
| Pullia | Statilia, | Vicirria) |
| Pupia | Stlaboria |  |
| Quinctia (less often Quint-) | Stlaccia $g, l$, cf. Stalcia C inf. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Vinicia (Vincia) sup. } \\ & \text { Viria sup. } \end{aligned}$ |
| Quintilia (never -ct-) | Stronnia (Stronia) | Visellia |
| Raia | Suettia (Suetia) | Vitellia |
| Remmia | Sulpicia | Vitrasia |
| Rubria | Tannonia (once | Vlpia |
| Rutilia | Tano-) | Vmbricia |
| Sabidia cf. inf. | Terentia $g$, $l$ | Volcacia (once Vlc-) |
| Sallustia | Tetteia | Volcia |
| Saluia inf.? | Tettia | Volusia (-ussia) |

2. Among the Cognomina may be mentioned

| Agrippa | Ga (Gaha, Gaa, Gaia, | Rufio |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Agrippinus | $\mathrm{Ge})$ masc. | Rufus |
| Aprilis | Januaria passim, often | Rufina passim |
| Bassus passim Bithus | serv., once Zan- | $\underbrace{\text { Rufina }}_{\text {Saturninus }}\}^{\text {passin }}$ |
| Cerdo | Musa vir. et mul. | Saturnius |
| Cerialis (on'ce Cere-) | Pansa | Siricus |
| Cilo | Papia often serv. | Speculator (Specl-) |
| Dama (-mas) mainly serv. | Polla passim, rarely | Statius serv. as cogn. Sulla |
| Dauus | Pola, Polus | Vatia |
| December | Pollio (Poli-) passim | Vesbinus |
|  | Proculus (Proci-) pas- | Vrsula |

B. Less frequent.

1. Nomina.

| gens Abuccia | Annaea (-ea) | Aufillia |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Accia | Anneia | Augusia |
| Aeclania | Anteia | Ania |
| Aefulana | Antia | Auidia |
| Aerullia lib. | Antracia | Auiena |
| Afllia (-ilia) lib. | Aplania | Aurunculeia |
| Ahia (Aia) | Apria | Autronia |
| Albiena | Apusia | Babbia inf. |
| Albinia | Arellia | Babria lib. |
| Aletia | Arulena | Babullia |
| Alfia | Asellia | Baburia |
| Alidia | Asuia lib. | Badia |
| Alliatoria | Atellia | Balonia |
| Allidia | Atinia | Barbia |
| Alliena | Atria | Bassia |
| Amatia | Atullia | Bebenia |
| Ambibia | Audasia | Bellica |
| Ampia | Audia sup. | Betutia (bis -tit-) |
| Ancharia | Auedia | Billiena |
| Aninia | Aufellia | Biuellia sup. |

${ }^{1}$ Cf, Auidia inf.

| Blaesia | Crassia | SGenucia (once) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Blassia | Crispina? | Genicia (once) |
| Bouia | Critonia | Gerellana |
| Buccia (Bucia) | Cupiennia | Germania |
| Kadia (one insc.) | Curatia (one insc.) | Gessia |
| Caecina | Curia | Gratilia |
| Caelia | Curiatia | Haia |
| Caepia | Curredia (Cure-) | Harmonia (one insc.) |
| Caesennia | Curuia | Hateria |
| Caesetia | Dasumia | Heia |
| Caiatia (also - $\eta$ (t-, g) | Deciria | $\left\{\begin{array}{l}\text { Heidia (once) }\end{array}\right.$ |
| Calauia sup. | Dellia | Heioleia |
| Saledia lib. | Dentatia | Helmonia |
| \{Calidia | Didia | Heluisia |
| Caluidia | Dionysia $g$, $l$ (nom. | Hermonia |
| Campania | sing. masc. - $\sigma$ ¢ $g$ ) | Hetrilia |
| Campilia (-pyl-) | Diria | Hippellia |
| Caneia | Dolutia | Hippia |
| Cantria | Domatia |  |
| Canuleia (-ol-) | Edia | Hirria |
| Caristania | Epillia | Horatia |
| Carmeis | Eppilia | Hortensia (once -tes-, |
| Carponia | Epria | once -tess-) |
| Caruilia | Faecia | Hosidia inf. |
| Cascellia | Foltonia cf. inf. | Hostria (one insc.) |
| Casuria | Felsinia | Ilippia |
| Catia | Fidia lib. | Instania |
| Catiena | Fiilia | Insteia |
| Caucia | Fistia | Istaueria |
| Caudia lib. | Erstia | Iteia |
| Ceionia | Flaminia | Iustuleia |
| Celeria | Floria | Iuuentia |
| Ceruia | Folia (once -11-) | Laetoria |
| Ceruonia | Fonteia $g, l$ | Lapscidia |
| Cestilia (once -ill-) | Fraucia | Laronia |
| Cicereia | Fufia | Lartia |
| Cincia | Fufidia | Lartidia |
| Cinnia | Fullonia | Lassia |
| Cissonia | Fulmonia lib. | Lepidia |
| Cloelia inf. | Fundania | Lisia |
| Clouatia sup. | Furnia g, I' (\$ору-) | Litria |
| Cluentia | Galeria | Liuineia |
| Confuleia (once -nfl) | Gallicia | Loreia |
| Consia | Gargilia | Lucania |
| Corelia | Gauidia | Luculana |
| Cosconia | Gauillia (one insc.) | Lufinia |
| Cossutia | Geminia | Luria |


| Lusiena | Muttia lib. | Peticia inf: |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lutatia | Naeuoleia lib. | Petillia (also -ilia) |
| Luxilia | Nassia | Pettia |
| Maecenas (once-atia) | Nauia $g, l$ | Pilonia |
| Maecilia | Neapolitana $g, l$ | Pitia |
| Maenatia lib. (one insc.) | Neia, see Naeuia, A | Plaetoria |
| \{Maenia (once) | $\stackrel{\text { sup. }}{\text { Neratio }}$ ( | Plania |
| \{Menia (once) | Neratia (once Naer-). | Plinia <br> Pontidia |
| Maesia | Nir | $\frac{\text { Pontidia }}{\text { Prastina }} \text { (once -inia) }$ |
| Maetennia | Noleia lib. | Prastina (once -inia) Prosia |
| Magnia | Norbana | Publia (once -leia) |
| Magonia | Nouellia | Pulfennia |
| Magria <br> Magulnia inf. | Numeria inf. | Pumidia |
| Magulnia inf. Mallia | Numidia | PPotiolana (once) |
| Mallonia | (Nunidia (once) | Put[eol]ana (once) |
| Mamercia inf. | Nunnidia (once) | Quirinia (one insc.) Rabiria |
| Mamilia | Obellia inf. | Raecia |
| Manneia | Obinia | Rafidia (one insc.) |
| Mars[ia? | Occia | Ragonia |
| Martia | Ocratia lib. | Rammia |
| Masuria | Oculatia (once Ocla-) | Rantiag, $l$ (one biling. |
| Maximia | Opsia $g$, $l$, sup. | insc.) |
| Meclonia | Orfia | Rapellia |
| Medullina | Ostoria | Rasidia |
| Melsonia | Otacilia | $\underline{\text { Rasinia }}$ |
| Mescinia | Ouellia (one insc.) | Rauia |
| Messenia lib. (one insc.) | Ouiedia | $\frac{\text { Rennia }}{\text { Rocia }}$ |
| Mestria | Pacuuia (twice | RRogia |
| Metilia | Papinia | Roscia |
| Meuiá (once Mae-) | Paquia ${ }^{1}$ | Rubellia |
| Minia sup. | Paruilia | Rufellia |
| Miniaria | Passenia (once -ienia) | Rufia |
| Modestia | Patercilia (one insc.) | Rufria (one insc.) |
| Modia | Pedania | Rullia |
| Monnia | Pedia | Rustia |
| Mucia | Percennia cf. sup. | Rusticelia |
| Mummia | Perelia | Sabinia |
| Murrasia | Perennia | Saenia $g, l$ (once Se-) |
| Musidia (once Muss-) | Perperna ${ }^{2}$ | Saginia |
| Muticuleia | Perpernia | Salaria |

[^37]| Salena | Tamudia | Venuleia |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Salliena | Tantilia | Verecundinia |
| Salluaia | Tapsenna | Vergilia (Vir-?) |
| Salonia | Tarquinia | Versiculana |
| Saluidiena | Tarulia (-ullia) | Vescinia |
|  | Tatia | Veseria |
| Sandelia | Teia | Vesia (one insc.) |
| Saturia | Teidia once | Vesiculana |
| Scalia | Tidia once | Vestoria |
| Scantia | Testia | Vesuia (graffiti -sb-) |
| Scurracia | Thorania | Vetilia |
| \{Senecia once | Tintiria sup | $\{$ Vettenia (one insc.) |
| (Senicia once |  | Vettena (one insc.) |
| Seppia sup, as praen. | Tintoria sup.? <br> Tofelana | Vettiena |
| Septimena |  | Vetuuia |
| Sepunia | Tornasia | Vibidia |
| Sertoria | Trebonia $g, l$ | Victoria (only fem.) |
| Seruia | Trolia (once Troila) | Vinnia (once Vinia) |
| Seueria | Truttedia | Vinullia |
| Sicillia (one insc.) | Tuccia | Vitoria |
| Silicia | Turcia | Vitruuia $g, l$ (once |
| Siluania | Turellia (one insc.) | -ouia) |
| Socil[i]a (one insc.) | Turia | Vittia |
| Spuria sup.? | Turronia (one insc.) | Vmbria |
| Staberia | Tuscenia | Vmmidia (once |
| Stallia (once Stalia) | Tuscilia | Vmi-) |
| Stennia (once Stenia) | Tutoria | Voconia |
| Stertinia | Vacaenia | Volasenna (once-ena) |
| \{Suauittia once | Valgia | masc. |
| Suauitia once | Variena (one insc.) | Volasennia fem. |
| Subidia? | Varronia | (Volteia once |
| Suedia | Vbonia | \{Vlteia once |
| Suellia | Vdia (one insc.) | Volumnia |
| Sullia | Vecilia | Vrbania |
| Sutia once | Velasia | Vruia |
| Suttis nom. masc. | Vellia | Vruineia |
| ( once | Velonia (one insc.) | Vulia |
| Taietia (one insc.) | Veluria | Vultricia |
| Tampia | Vennia |  |

1a. To these may be added Vestia Liv. 26. 33, Val. Max. 5. 2. 1.

## 2. Among the Cognomina.

| Abinnericus (Abenn-) | Eglectianus | Papus (Paap.) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Aciba (-bas) | Eglectus | Peplus (Pepul-) |
| Aeterius | Haber | Pollitta |
| Ambibulus | Hamillus | Quirinus |
| $\underbrace{\text { Apella }}_{\text {Ammia }}$ g, $l$ | Lamiscus $g$ | Rufilla |
| Aprulla | Liccaeus | Rumavir |
| Ascla | Mahes cf. sup. | Sandilianus |
| Asprenas | Maro $g, l$ | Scirtus |
| Audentius | Marullus | Sedulatus (Sedl-) <br> Silo |
| Bato | Melanta vir. | Sisenna |
| Cannutianus | Nasica | Sosus |
| Cocco | Naso (once Nasso) | Staius $g$, l, inf. |
| Coeranus | Nemesis (once Nimi- | Strobilus |
| Columbus | sis, once Nempsis) | Tauriscus |
| Decmus $g$ | Nouicius | Tontianus |
| Dumans (Dym-) | Paccius) | Vrsio |
|  | $\overline{\text { Pacius }}$ | Vrsus |

C. Occurring once only.

## 1. Nomina.

| gens Abbia (Abia?) |
| :--- |
| (Acceiana) |
| Aceria |
| Acerratia |
| Aclutia |
| Aconia |
| Adia |
| Aebutia |
| Aecia |
| Aerelia? |
| Aeria |
| Aesia |
| Aeternia |
| Afinia |
| Afrania |
| Afronia? |
| Agidia |


| Agnania | Anniana |
| :--- | :--- |
| Aieza (masc.) and | Antilia lib. |
| Aiezia in one insc. | Apicata |
| Aiscidia | Apisia |
| Alacria | Apollonia |
| Alfenatia | Appaea |
| Allenia | Apponia |
| Alonia? | Apronia |
| Alpinia | Aquuia |
| Alsia | Arcaea |
| Ambonia? | (Arelliana) |
| Amicia | Armenia |
| Ammia | Arquinia lib. |
| Ampedia | Arsenia |
| Amuria | Aruttia |
| Ancarsia | Ascia |
| Anna? | Atania |


| Ateleia lib. | Caetronia | Crepe(reia) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Atidia $l i b$. | Calarsia | Crispia |
| Atisia | Calenia | Curfia |
| Atleia | Calinia | Currelia lib. |
| Atlia? | Calpetana | Cusia |
| Atulena? | Caltilia lib. | Cusonia |
| Aufania | Camelia? | $\overline{\text { Cutia }}$ |
| Aufeia | Cameria lib. | Daeria lib. |
| Auliena | Campia | ${ }^{\text {Dasiatia }}$ |
| Ausidia | Camuria | Dassia |
| Autonia | Cantilia | Dexia |
| Autrodia | Carania lib. | Dexsonia |
| Axia? | Carnia | Doia |
| Badeia? | Carpinaria | Drusia |
| Baebiana | Carpinia? | Dullania? |
| Baibilia | Carsicia | Duronia |
| Barbaria | Cartilia | Durrachina |
| Barbatia | Cartoria | Eassidia |
| Baria | Casonia lib. | Efuria (Christian) |
| Baronia | Catenia | Eggia |
| Basilia | Catilia | Egrilia |
| Bassaea | Cauilia lib. | Eitag |
| Bassida | Cauinnia | Eiedia |
| Batonia | Caulia | Elusia lib. |
| Belitia? | Kaulimertia? | Emuslena? |
| Belliena | Celsia $g$ | Enuleia? |
| Beneuertia | Cepidia lib. | Eruia |
| Bentuellia | Cessia | Escionia |
| Beriena | $\overline{\text { Cestia }}$ | Essennia |
| B $\quad$ púrıos? g | Circenia | Ethereia lib. |
| Betiliena | Cisionia | Etria |
| Betubia | Cispia | Fabullia |
| Beuila? | Cludia | Fafinia |
| Bifonia | Cogitatia | Falconia |
| Bisellia | Comanana? | Faustia |
| Boionia (? cognom.) | Comicia | Felsonia |
| Brasidia | Connia | Feronia |
| Brexia | Considia | Feruenia |
| Bruttidia | Constantia | Festinia |
| Bubbia | Cordiuia lib. | Ficilia lib. |
| Buccionia lib. | Cosidia | Fictoria |
| Burria | Cotria | Fiduia |
| Cabilena | Couia | Firuia |
| Caedia | Crassicia | Fotidia |
| Caedicia g | Cratilia | Fulcinia |
| Caesernia | Craudelia | Fullia |


| Fuluinia | Macullia | Nutria |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Fundilia | Maculonia lib. | Obultronia |
| Furnia | Maesonia lib. | Ocabia? |
| Futia | Magnisia | Ofania |
| Galliania | Mamidia | Ofilliena |
| Galonia lib. | Mascaia | Ofonia |
| Gargonia lib. | Masia | Oliena |
| Gelonia | Matia | Opetreia |
| Gentia | Maticia | Orania lib. |
| Gerontia | Matteia | Orenia |
| Gigania | Matutina | Orfellia |
| Gracilia | Medioleia | Organia |
| Graeceia | Menlia? lib. | Otia |
| Graia | Mesonia | Otincia |
| Graltia | Mestia | Pandia |
| Grattia lib. | Meteia | Panentia |
| Grusia | Mincullia | Pariana |
| Gupacia | Minisia | Patidia lib. |
| Hatilia | Mintullia? | Paxea |
| Hegia | Minutia lib. | Peducaea |
| Helenia | Morasia | Pelacisana? |
| Herbacia | Mullia | Pestania |
| Herdonia | Multillia lib. | Petelia |
| Hinoleia lib. 250 B.c. | Muluia | Petillia |
| Hispellatia | Mulutia? | Petisana |
| Iallia | Musia | Pileia |
| Igiacf. inf. |  | Pinnia |
| Instueia |  | Purria lib. |


| Rabilia | Siculia | Titucia |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Racectia | Silania? | Tituria |
| Raconia | Siminia | Toratia |
| Ramnia | Siria | Trausia |
| Rapellinia | Sirinia? | Trebania |
| Rapidia | Siternia | Trebatia |
| Rapinasia | Sitria | Trebellia |
| Ratinia | Soenia | Trebulana |
| Rattia | Solania | Triaria lib. |
| Rauonia | Sora | Trisenia |
| Riria? | Stabia | Tuppuria |
| Romania | Staedia inf. | Tureia |
| Rufinia | Stalcia g cf. Stlaccia | Tussia |
| Rupilia | A sup. <br> Statria | Tussidia |
| Rutedia lib. | Stlabia | Tuticia |
| Sacconia | Stonicia | Tutilia |
| Sacratoria | Suetria | Vaccinia |
| Saeriz | Suillia | Vagellia |
| Safinia lib. inf. | Sulgia | Valia ${ }^{\text { }}$ |
| Sagaria | Surdinia | Varacia |
| Sagittia | Sutoria | Varredia? lib. |
| Salenia | Tadia | Vatinia (spelt Bat-) |
| Saluidena | Talpia? | Veionia |
| Samianta? | Tamusia | Velina |
| Samiaria | Taracia | Venafrana |
| Samilaris? | Tarronia | Venelia sup. |
| Sanquinia | Tarsinnia | Veneria |
| Satellia | Tataiag | Venidia |
| Satia | Tedilia | Verginia |
| Saturn[i]a | Tesnea? | Veridia |
| Saturninia | Tetiana | Veronia |
| Scribonia | Tettiena | Verticia lib. |
| Secura | Thermia | Vespasia |
| Senatia | Thoria | Vestilia |
| Sepullia | Thresia? | Vestricia sup. |
| Sepumia | Tiberia | Vetidia |
| Serenia | Ticidia | Vetronia |
| Seruatronia | Tidia | Vettuleia lib. |
| Seruea | Timinia | Vettulena |
| Sestilia | Tineia | Vettulina |
| Sestullia | Titacia | Vibellia ${ }^{2}$ |
| Setia | Titilia | Vibiedia |
| Sexsaea | Titiria | Vibullia |

[^38]| Viceia | Viriana | Volteia |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Vigellia | Virofurcia ? | Vottonia |
| Viguetia | Virridia? | Vrbinia |
| Villia | Virtia | Vrsena fem |
| Vinuleia | Vitronia | Vrsidia |
| Vipsania | Vituria | Vttedia |
| Vipstana | Volceia | $\underline{\text { Vttia }}$ |
| Virasia | Volsonia |  |

1 a. To these may be added Spendius, the name of a Campanian slave mentioned several times in Polyb. 1. 69 f.

## 2. Among the Cognomina.

| Abinneus | Cotta | Gaulanus |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Acisculus? | Crixsus | Gemniana |
| Aiula | Dada lib. | Hauranus |
| Amisenus | Daelochus $g$ | Interemnia |
| Atrista | Dagalaifus | Iouinus |
| Attus $g$ | Darda | Iuena |
| Balitor | Dasumilla | Iullinus |
| Banna | Denate | Larenianus |
| Baudigo | Dipscurtus | Larix vir <br> Lebinthus |
| Bauto | Dizo | Leborianus ${ }^{2}$ |
| Beba | Domnina lib. | Legio lib. |
| ${ }^{\text {Beriola }}{ }^{1}$ | Domnio | Liberitas mul. |
| Betua | Drosis | Licca (Bardi filia) |
| Blaesus | Fango | Ligatus |
| Blesilla | Fango | Lucipor? |
| Buricus | Fimbria | Mama |
| Burrus lib. | Fistia | Mamercus g inf. |
| Buttis | Flore? (acc. -enem) | Mamia |
| Carradius | Fortona | Maricanus |
| Cascus | Futus | Maruleius |
| Cenna vir. | Gailla | Masa |
| Cersinus | Galeo | Mattius (Christian) |
| Chorintus | Gangens | Mela |
| Citias mul. | Garfanius | Melas |
| Codeus | Garmalla vir | Mommo |
| Cordus | Gates vir | Mucurda |

1 The insc. (x. 2000) continues 'quae vixit etc.' (not bixit), therefore $b$ seems to have its proper value.
${ }^{2}$ Cf. Leboriac 154 B.

| Naeuilla | Pumaceo | Sopio |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Natta | Puupa | Stolo |
| Ninus | Ratiager | Suilla vir |
| Nugula | Redienus | Talicius |
| October | Rocula | Tatis |
| Ofellio | Rufula | Terio lib. |
| Ofellius inf. | Rullus | Tubero |
| Olcanus | Russa | Tugurinus |
| Olenius | Saba vir | Vadauo |
| Opscus | Sabbio serv. | Vescinus |
| Osidia serv. | Sabbis lib. mul. | Vettulinus |
| Ossucula | Sabinna lib. vir | Vetulenus |
| Pacyllus $g$ | Sandona | Vibius (but frequent |
| Papas ${ }^{2}$ | Sarnesis | as praenomen) |
| Passaratus | Sasa lib. vir | Vinda |
| Pausia | Sattius | Firtws Kretschmer |
| Pepsus lib. | Satulla | Griech. Vasenin- |
| Porresmus | Scaeua vir | schrr. p. 3. |
| Posilla | $\Sigma_{\text {Kár }}$ acs g | Vopiscus |
| Procca | Scemanus | Vpotiana |
| Procea | Sclemio mul. | Vrsilla <br> [V]ttedianus |
| Pullaene | Scoa lib. vir | [V]ttedianus <br> Zobinus |

[^39]
## B. The Samnite Tribes

## (Hirpini, Pentri et Caraceni S̃amnites).

The Samnite alliance when it first appears in history, in the fourth century B.C., included those tribes which lay between the Paeligni to the North, the Lucani to the South, the Campanians to the West, the Frentani and Apuli to the East; that is to say the Hirpini ${ }^{1}$, Pentri and Caraceni ${ }^{2}$; but with these are sometimes classed other friendly and kindred communities in neighbouring territory, like the originally independent Fistelia and Allifae (see their coins 183-4 inf.), Salernum and the Frentani (Scylax, quoted p. 203 inf.), and Atina (Liv. 10. 39). But after the war with Pyrrhus the Romans for ever weakened the power of the Italic tribes by dividing this central mountainous tract into two halves. The territories of the Latin colony Beneventum (268 B.c.) and the Ager Taurasinus ${ }^{3}$ united that of Saticula on the West ( 313 b.c. $)^{4}$ to that of Luceria ${ }^{5}$ on the East, and cut off the Hirpini from their kinsmen by a broad belt of land under Latin occupation. At the same time the Samnites proper were weakened by the loss of a large strip on the West; Telesia, Compulteria and Caiatia became independent communities (see their coins 182, 149 and Note xvi. p. 143f.), Allifae and Venafrum became praefectures (Fest. p. 233 M), and the Latin colony of Aesernia was founded in 263 b.c. in purely Samnite territory to command the upper Volturnus valley. These chains held the northern Samnites fast; we hear of no further resistance on their part till the general uprising of Italy in 90 B.C. But the Hirpini henceforth acted independently; in 216 they

[^40]joined Hannibal, and the name Samnium no longer extends to them (Liv. 22. 73). In the Social war they appear as a separate unit (e.g. Appian B. C. I. 39). But both Samnites ${ }^{1}$ and Hirpini retained their complete internal independence until they received the Roman citizenship, after the terrible wars of $90-82$ b.c. had reduced their territory to the desert-like condition in which a great part of it remains to this day.

## 1. Hirpini.

## 156-7 Inscriptions of Aeclanum.

Of Aeclanum we know nothing hefore the Social War, when it was besieged by Sulla (App. B. C. 1. 51), though a party headed by one Minatius Magius the atavus of Velleius (2. 16) was faithful to Rome. From the passage in Velleius Moinmsen (C. I. L. Ix. p. 99) infers that the town did not become a municipium till then; but that this was its condition from at least 60 b.c. till Hadrian, appears from many Latin insec.

156 Found in Castello d. Baronia, east of Aeclanum, and copied by Sign. F. Cassitto, whence Momm. U. D. viii. 13, whence Zvet. Osc. v. 6. The original was cut up and used for building.

## km babbiis km

On a stone 68 in . long by 21 high ( 1.71 by 527 m .) in letters over 2 in . ( .052 m .) high, Osc. $a \beta$, with single interpuncts, two of which the copy places withiu the second word, which it gives as bn.b.biis; the $n$ must have been $N$ without its top.
U. D. p. 177, Fabr. 2881, Zvet. Osc. 28.

On a tile found in October 1880 in one of the tombs of an ancient necropolis among the remains of some unknown city at Pezza, near Melito (Valle Bonito), and now said to be in the Naples Museum (though its exact position does not seem known to the officials) ; given by Pecori in Notiz. Scav. 1881, p. 328.

$$
N\rangle|\Pi\rangle \mid \cdot]
$$

Either V. Kpi. Gn. or V. Igpi. Gn., cf. no. 77 supr. Observe the Lat. N.

[^41]
## 158-9 Coins of adjacent Towns.

## Modern Lacedonia.

## akudunniad

Osc. aß retrograde: bronze: type, Pallas-head ) ( warrior with patera, shield and sword : rare.

This town was on the borders of Apulia, near to, but, I believe, distinct from the ancient and modern Aquilonia, v. 160 A infra. Beloch observes (Ital. Bd. p. 168) that the town to which the coin belongs cannot have been a member of the Hirpine alliance, since then it would not have issued coins in its own name, and conjectures that it was an independent Samnite settlement, in what should then be called Apulian territory.

Head p. 24, Poole p. 68, Friedl. O. M. p. 53, Zvet. Osc. 169.

Beneventum.

## benuentod )( propom

The use of the ablative and the second $p$ of propom (if it stands for probum, which appears on coins of Suessa, C. I. L. I. ${ }^{1}$ 16) must be due to Oscan influence, though the coin is from a Roman colony (planted 268 b.c., when the name was changed from MajoFє $\boldsymbol{\nu}$ - to Beneventum). If the name is trisyllabic and not abbreviated, the form might be explained as based on an Oscan Malvento-, which, as compared with the Greek original, would seem to show the regular Oscan syncope, cf. Herklo- from 'Hpak $\lambda \hat{\eta} s$, Evklo- (175 inf.) from Ev̉ko入os (37 D sup.); but Keller (Lat. Volksetym. p. 14) reads the legend as benuuen-.

Lat. $a \beta$, with $\Gamma=p$. Bronze : type, Apollo-head ) (horse running. C. I. L. I. 19, Momm. U. D. p. 203, Head p. 24, Poole p. 68.

Note xix. Compsa. For possibly Oscan coins of Compsa (C OSANO, ONA1O), Poole p. 69, Head p. 25) v. Note xvi. supr. p. 143 f.

## 160 Place-names ${ }^{1}$ of the Hirpini ${ }^{2}$.

A. Well attested (in form, date and locality).

Hirpīni cl. cf. hirpo- 186 A inf. and 351 B. Irpino e.g. M. Câlvo Irp.
Compsa, -sanus (K $\hat{\mu} \mu \psi a)$. cl. -inus insce. Lib. Col. Cónza della Campania.
Aufĩus f. cl. Offanto $f$.
Abellinum, -inates (Protropi et Marsi, Plin. 3. 11. 105) cl. inscc. Avellino.
Ampsanctus loc. cl.
Taurăsĭa, -sinus cl., C. I. L. I. ${ }^{1}$ 30. ? Taurási, see Momm. C. I. L. 1. c.

Aquilonia, -onii cl. This town I venture on the ground of its name to identify with the modern Aquilonia and to distinguish from the modern Lacedonia, six miles to the N.W., which must, I think, represent the Osc. Akudunnia- 158 sup. The ancient Aquilonia was on the Via Appia between Aeclanum and Venusia, and on Kiepert's map this is made to pass through mod. Lacedonia on the strength of the usual identification; I cannot find that there is any other authority for this route, which involves a bend northwards into the hills, whereas mod. Aquilonia is on a straight line drawn from Aeclanum to Venusia. There are only a few Lat. insec. from Lacedonia (with no mention of the town itself) and none from Aquilonia. The question, I suppose, could be settled by careful examination of the existing roads ${ }^{3}$; but failing that the correspondence of the two pairs of names gives a prima facie probability to the view here suggested.
Trǐuīcum Hor. Sat. 1. 5. 79. Trevíco.
Aeclanum, -nus, -nensis cl. insce. (Aecl- inscc., Aecul- Cic. Plin. etc., cf. Momm. C. I. L. ix. pp. 88, 98). Mirabella Ecláno.
Caudium, -dinus, Furculae Caudinae cl. inscc. Keller Lat. Volksetym. p. 16 compares $S$. María dei Góóti and suggests a new etymon for Furculae. Vâlle Caudina.
[Ligures Baebiani cl. inscc., cf. Liv. 40. 38.]
${ }^{1}$ For the notation and arrangement, see the List of Signs and Abbreviations.

- The tables of the Itineraries for the Hirpini are given C. I. L. Ix. p. 26.
${ }^{3}$ My friend Prof. A. G. Amatucci of Tivoli, formerly of Benevento, has been at some pains to ascertain for me from Ms. l'Abbato Troyse that the road usually identified with the Via Appia does not touch the site of either of the two modern towns, but passes between them, rather nearer Lacedonia; and that according to the local tradition neither of the two occupies the site of the ancient Aquilonia.
$\left\{\begin{array}{l}\text { Beneuentum, -tanus cl. inscc. after } 268 \text { в.c., cf. } 159 \text { sup. Before that } \\ \text { Men }\end{array}\right.$ Maleuentum i.e. Màóés cl. nm. Benevénto.

The following names of Pagi in Beneventum occur more than once in the T'ab. Alimentaria Ligurum Baebianorum, C. I. L. Ix. 1455 :
Fascianus, Herculaneus, Martialis, Mefanus (ter), Meflanus, (sexipss), Salutaris.
Tăburnus mons. cl. M. Tabirno.
Sătīcŭla, -lanus. cl. (-lus poet.)
Calor fl. el. Calôre f.
[Via Herculia inscc. v. Momm. C. I. L. x. p. 709.]
Aequum Tuticum. cl. (Aeq- Acr. Porphyr. ad Hor. Sat. 1. 5. 87, and Tab. Peut. ; elsewhere Eq-).

## B. Less certain.

Amaranus Jupiter C. I. L. ix. 1074 (from Compsa). ? Mónte Maráno.
Arusini campi near Beneventum, Frontin. Strateg. 4. 1. 14 al.
Sabatus fl. Itin. Anton. Sábato $f$.
Cisauna C. I. L. I. ${ }^{1}$ 30, adj. or subst.?
Romula Mephitis Itinn., - ea urbs, Liv. 10. 17. ?Monte Rưmulo (Kiep.).
Plistia (пतeढनтikn) Liv. 9. 21-22 al. Presta.
Vescellium Liv., -ellani Pl. 3. 11. 105.
Pagi Beneuentani. The following names occur only once in C. I. L. Ix. 1455 (cf. under A sup.) -
Albanus, Articulanus, Caclanus, Catillinus, Cetanus, Horticulanus, Libicanus, Libitinus, Saeculanus, Tebanus, Tucianus. Also the fundi Lusianus, Nasennianus, Profianus, Suellianus, and the Kasae Aquaerata, Foederna.

## C. Doubtful.

^íßupvò ópos Polyb. III. 100. 2 (passed by Hannibal on his march to Luceria, cf. Helbig Hermes xi. p. 272 and p. 16 sup.).
Orbitanium? Liv. 24. 20.

Trebianus ager between Saticula and Suessula, Liv. 23. 14.
Vicilini Jovis templum in agro Compsano Liv. 24. 44.
Pagus Veianus? C. I. L. ix. 1503. Pago Veiáno.
Strapellini Pl. 3. 11. 105. YEtpaatovòov Ptol. 3. 1. 62 (Фpar-codd.). ? Rapólla.
Melae Liv. 24. 20 ?cf. Meles (plur.) id. 27. 1.
Marmoreae Liv. 27. 1.
Cimetra? Liv. 10. 15.
Ad Tanarum or Tam-? It. Ant. p. 109. Támmaro f.
Vercellium? Liv. 23. 37.
Sicilinum Liv. 23. 37.
[Forum Nouum Itinn.]
Syllae? Tab. Peut.
Pisandes Tab. Peut.
[Honoratianum It. Ant. p. 103.]
[ad Matrem Magnam It. Ant, p. 103.]
Nucriola? Tab. Peut., -cerulae It. Rav. 4. 33.
The following are only mentioned in Pl. 3. 11. 105.
Aletrini.
Alfellani? v. Note xxxvi B p. 335 inf. s.v. *A filae.
Borcani.
Irini.
Turnantini.
Ulurtini.
Corinenses (Corinium was in llyria).

## D. Further modern names.

Calitri, Núsco, Lióni, Carife, Zúngoli, Ariúno di Puglia, Savignáno di Puglia, S. Áng. all'Ésca, Fontanarósa, Durazzáno, Airôla, Pietrastornína, Montesúrchio, Cirignúno, Pástene, Bonáto, Ápice, Versáno, Dugénta, Vituláno, Paupîsi, Padúli, Montemále, Stúrza, Casúlbore, Réino, Mücchia, Fragnéto, S. Marco de' Cavoti, Morcóne.

## 161 Personal Names ${ }^{1}$ of the Hirpinia.

## A. Frequent.

1. Nomina.

2. Among the Cognomina may be mentioned:

| Bassus | Proculus | Rufus lib. |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Ianuarius lib. | Rufinus | Saturninus |

[^42]
## B. Less frequent.

## 1. Nomina.

| gens Abidia one inse. <br> Acilia | Clippiana one insc. Cocceia (once Coce-) | Lucceia <br> Lucretia |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Adiectia | Cominia inf. | Maecia |
| Agria | Concordia | Maenia |
| Albania | Cosia | Mamercia |
| Albia | Crassa? one insc. | Mamia |
| Aldia one insc. | Crassicia | Manilia |
| Aletia | Crispia | Maximilliana |
| Amarfia | Critonia | Messia lib. |
| Amia (once, and once | Curia | Metilia |
| -mm.) | Decia (once -cc-) | Minia inf. |
| Anicia | Didia | Modia |
| Appia lib. | Domatia lib. | Moluia lib. |
| Appuleia | Domitia | Mucia |
| Areia one insc. | Egnatia | Mummeia |
| Asinia | Epidia inf. | Mummia |
| Atria | $\frac{\text { Eppia }}{\text { Fabricia }}$ | Murria |
| Audeia inf. | Firmilia | Nasellia |
| Aufidia | Firueia | Natria |
| Aufilia lib. | Firuia | Obideia |
| Auidia | Fluria one insc. | Ocellia lib. |
| Babidia lil., one insc. | Folia | Oclatia |
| Badia | Fonteir | Opimia |
| Blasia (once Blass-) | Fregania | Ouania lib. |
| all in one insc. | Fuficia | Ouia |
| Brittia (once Brutt-) | Fulcinia | Paccia (once Pacia) |
| Caecia | Fuluia (Fol-) | Papiria (-per |
| Caecilia | Fundania | Pescennia |
| Caesutia lib. | Furia | Pescennia |
| Caluentia | Gauia | Petillia (-ilia) |
| Campilia | Gellia | Platia one insc. |
| Capria | Hirria (once Hiria) | Plautia inf. |
| Carfana | Hostria | Plotia |
| Cascellia | Ignia | Pompulia |
| Cassia | Iruinia | Postumia |
| Castricia inf. | Labiena | Procilia |
| Catia | Latinia | Publicia |
| Catineia | Liconia | Pullia |
| Ceruia | Liuia | Pullidia |
| Cincia | Liuinia | Pupia |


| Rhaesia | Sergia | Turellia |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Robilia | Sertoria | Turpilia |
| Rubria | Sestidia (once Sext-) | Tussidia |
| Rufinia | Sextilia | Varia |
| Rufria | Statoria | Varronia |
| Sabidia inf. | Stenia (once Stennia) | Vassia |
| Saccidia one insc. | Sulpicia | Vatinia |
| Salinatoria | Tanonia (once Tan- | Veratia |
| Sallustia | no-) | Vergilia |
| Salluvia | Tarquinia | Vesedia |
| Saluia | Tautonia | Vesonia |
| Samia (once, and | Teidia lib. | Vesuedia |
| once -mm-) | Terentia | Vesullia |
| Sassia one insc. | Tetarfena one insc. | Viciria |
| Satria | Titacia | Villia |
| Sattia | Titia | Vinia one inse. |
| Scaniania | Togia | Vinucia (-nic-, inf.) |
| Secundia | Traia | Vlpia |
| Sentia | Trebellia | Voconia |
| Septicia | Trebulana | Volumnia |
|  |  |  |

## 2. Among the Cognomina.

Ambibolus, -ulus
Cerialis
Polla inf,

Posilla
Queta (=Quieta)
Rufio lib.
Salvius lib.
Vrsulus
Vrsus

Asuia lib.
Atteia
Attia
Auidiena
Auillia
Barbia
Belleia
Bergonia
Bittia?
Bouia
Burreia
Buttia
Cacelia
Caedia
Caleia

| Calpena | Gargonia | [Ogu]lnia |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Camurtia | Gauelia | Opetreiia |
| Canonia lib. | Gauillia | Opicia |
| Caprelia lib. | Geminia | Orfellia |
| Careia | Graeceia | Palia |
| Cateia | Haia | Papinia |
| Cauponia | Hostidia | Patulcia |
| Cebetina? | Insontia | Paucia |
| Celsia? | Iuentia | Pedia lib. |
| Ciminia ? | (Iustiniana) | Peducea |
| Cipia inf., ? sup. | Labia | Percennia lib |
| Classetia | Labicia | $\overline{\text { Perennia }}$ |
| Cleppia | Laelia | Petellia |
| Cluaia | Laetilia | Petuellia |
| Codiflania | $\underline{\text { Lafria }}$ | Pineia |
| Coelia | Laria | Pismatia |
| Coponia | Laronia | Plaetoria |
| Cossonia | Lepidia | Platoria |
| Couia | Libonia | Pollia |
| Crustidia | $\underline{\text { Liccia? }}$ | Pontiniena |
| Culeia | Ligeria | Pontiniena |
| Dasimia | Longia | Popillia |
| Decumia | Longiniana | Prastina (nom |
| Egullia | Luccaea | Priscia |
| Epria (spelt Aep-) | Lucerina | Quintilia |
| Epuria | Lucilia | Raia |
| Erecia ? | Lucudeia | Rasoria? |
| Ermia | Lusia | Ratellia? |
| Erucia | Maeuia | Rubellina |
| Erullia? | Magulia | Rufia |
| Etrilia | Maia | Sabernia |
| Fabia | Maioria ? | Safronia |
| Fadia | Mallia | Saturnia |
| Faelia | Mamidia | Scrateia |
| Falcilia | Mandorina | Seia |
| Faltonia | Manlia | Semmia |
| Fannia | Minatia inf. | Serueia lib. |
| Ferennia | Murratena | Seruen[i]a |
| Figilia | Mutia | Sextuleia |
| Fillia | Nasennia | Sicilia |
| Firmia | Nasidia | Silana? |
| Fisia | Nemitia? | Sontia |
| Flacceia | Neria | Sosia |
| Flaminia | Numeria | Spendia |
| Fullonia | Numicia | Stafonia |
| Funia lib. | Nummia | Statilia |
| Gagilia | Obellia | Suessania |


| 161 C | PERSONAL NAMES OF THE HIRPINI. |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Tacitia lib. | Titria | 179 |
| Tadia | Trebularia | Veiedia |
| Taraueia | Tuccia | Velia? |
| Taronia | Tullia | Vellaea |
| Tattia | Tulliana | Venaecia |
| Teiedia | Tullidia | Vettena |
| Tettaea | Tullonia | Vibria (Christian) |
| Theia? | Turrania | Vibulca? |
| Tidia | Turturia | Vibuleia |
| Tigia lib. | Valgia | Viria (spelt Bi-, |
| Tillia | Vaterria | Christian) inf. |
| Tintiria inf. | Vebia | Visellia lib. |
| Tintoria | Vediania lib. | Vitellia |
| Titilia | Vituria |  |
| Titinia |  | Veiania |

2. Among the Cognomina.

| Abonianus | Geminiana | Rufillus |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Afinia | Lanuarianus | Sattianus |
| Apio lib. | Laliana | Saturtinus |
| Apronianus | Laurus | Scinus |
| Arrenianus | Lausus | Segisultus |
| Arura | Maro | Specula |
| Auxentius | Marullus | Statius praen. |
| Burrus | Marus | Stattis |
| Caeserinus | Nouember | Suettlus |
| Corcia vir lib. | Pollitta | Tricunda serv. vir |
| Dama | Restio | Vibrio |
| Egloge |  |  |

## 2. Samnium proper.

## 162-169 Inscriptions of Macchia, Molise, Altilia, etc.

Found about 1750 in Macchia in Valfortore S.W. of Larinum (so that it might almost equally well be called Apulian), taken to Naples and lost. The text depends on a fairly intelligible copy by de Vita, Antiquit. Benevent. I. append., p. lxi (which I saw at Beveventum in April 1894); whence Momm. U. D., viii. 12, and Zvet. Osc. v. 5; the original was seen by de Vita, but lost in Naples, where it had been taken to decide a lawsuit as to the property in which it was found!

## ...klum maatreis... <br> ...ras futre.e?...

Osc. aß. On a fragment of marble apparently somewhat worn; no interpuncts are recorded. 1. 1. Of $\mathbf{k}$ only the lower fork appears; over this and the next two letters an accidental line. 1. 2, after e appears room for at least one letter and then $e$, which Mommsen took to be a misread $s$, correcting futreis. There is no indication from which the size of the whole insc. could be conjectured; and it is equally hard to say what town it came from. Macchia is about the centre of an equilateral triangle whose points are Larinum (N.), Luceria (S.E.) and Bovianum Undec. (S.W.). U.D. p. 176, Fabr. 2895, Zvet. Osc. 27.

Found in 1868 near Molise, N. of Campobasso, where it still is near the chiesuola of S. Maria del Piano, in the open air. First published by Caraba Gioru. Scav. Pomp. n.s. I. p. 209; Zvet. Osc. v. 1 gives a photograph. The text is from an impression obtained with great difficulty by Prof, A. de Nino, and sent to me with his usual kindness.

## bn betitis bn meddiss průffed

Boldly and not quite regularly engraved in Osc. $a \beta$, the letters (except人) rectangular and nearly 2 in . ( 043 m .) high on a block of limestone 69 in . long by 21 high ( 1.73 by 53 m .) ; interpunct single ; the text is everywhere clear and certain. The character of the writing is somewhat archaic, $\stackrel{\circ}{\mathrm{u}}$ is $\ddot{Y}$, the top and bottom strokes of $\mathbf{s}$ are almost horizontal, and the cusps of $\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{d}, \mathrm{f}$ do not touch the opposite stroke.

Beloch (Ital. Bund, p. 169) points out that since tiovtiks is not added as in 170, the magistrate here named probably belonged not to the whole

Samnite (or Pentrian Samnite?) tribe, but to some particular town; possibly then this was the municipium Bovianum (Boiano), which lies about 10 miles south of Molise, see the note to 170 . Mom. however (C. I. L. IX. p. 239) supposes that there was a Samnite town on the site of Molise. No Latin inscc. have been found here.

Fabr. Suppl. I. 508, Zvet. Osc. 22.

164 Found in 1823 in Altilia, the ancient Saepinum, first published by Lepsius, Insc. Osc. Umb. p. 89, who supposed it a forgery; now in the Naples Museum. Zvet. Osc. v. 3 gives a facsim. made by de Petra; the text is from a sketch sent me by Sogliano.

## pis tiů | iiv kůru | pooiiu baiteis | aadiieis ai.fi..eis

Carved in relief round a roughly oval, yellowish stone 2 in . high, 3 in . long (.052 by $\cdot 075 \mathrm{~m}$.) the letters 012 m . high; the ends of the 3 rd and 4 th lines are much worn away. Osc. $a \beta$, rectangular, with double interpunct, inserted even at the ends of the lines; when the insc. is interpreted we shall be able to judge whether $\stackrel{i}{\mathbf{1}}$ and $\stackrel{\circ}{\mathbf{u}}$ are used consistently; if the first word $=$ Lat. quis we should certainly have expected $i$, but $\mathbf{i}$ seems certain. $\quad 1.2 \mathrm{~V}$ might be a damaged e. $\quad 3$ is at the end is practically certain, only the lower halves are clear in de Petra's facsim. 4 Of the last word the first $i$ may be only $i$, the next sign is obscure; after $\mathbf{f}$, which is fairly certain, either $\mathbf{i}$ or $\mathbf{i}$, then a gap, then e or $\mathbf{V}$.

For attempted explanations see Bücheler, Rh. Mus. 1878 (Osk. Bleitafel), p. 29, who is perhaps more successful than Bugge, Kuhn's Zeitschr. xxir. p. 438.

Saepinum (C. I. L. IX. p. 227) was a municipium down to a late epoch. Many of its Latin inscc. belong to Augustan times, but none appear to be earlier.
U. D. p. 176, Fabr. 2878, Zvet. Osc. 25.

165 Found in 1777 on a hill at Rocca Aspromonte ${ }^{1}, 9$ miles from Boiano, among the ruins of a temple of Minerva, together with an interesting archaic statue of the goddess, which Mommsen has certainly identified with one now in the Antikenkabinet, Vienna; the altar-like stone on which the insc. was engraved, was broken in half by the local cure, as a heathenish relic, but a record of it
${ }^{1}$ On which side of Boiano this small spot may lie I have been unable to discover. The distance would suit Molise.
with the insc. was preserved in a Lettera di Domenico Cerulli a Mons. Gürtler vescovo di Tiene........sopra un' antica statua etrusca, Naples 1777, whence Mommsen's text, U. D. ix. (with a sketch of the statue), reproduced by Zvet. Osc. $\nabla .2$; the following text is equally from Mommsen.

## tanas niumeriis | frunter

Regularly cut in Osc. a $\beta$, with double but very elegant interpunct; we cannot conclude from -riis that $i$ was wanting, cf. $39,44,45$ etc. According to the copy $\mathbf{n}$ is $N$ in the first and last words, but $W$ in the second, where also $M$; the first s is $\Pi$, the second $F$, points which go to support Mommsen's views, founded reasonably on the Latin form of the gentile name (-meriis, pure Osc. -msis), that it is a fairly late insc., and the double punct an affected archaism.
U. D. p. 174, Fabr. 2879, Zvet. Osc. 24.

On ■ broken tile $\cdot 395 \mathrm{~m}$. long, found in 1843 at Castellone, a mile from Boiano ; where it now is I do not know; published by Momm. Bull. Arch. Nap. iv. p. 116, and U.D. p. 175, viii. 9, whence Fabr. 2880, Zvet. Osc. 26. Osc. $\alpha \beta$, single interpunct.
...t pk lai pk

Note xx. The letters $8 日$ or $g \exists$ were on the bottom of a vase of black clay found in 1855 near Tiro, 10 miles from Campobasso, and now lost. Minervini, Bull. Arch. Nap. iii. p. 131, whence Fabr. 2886, Zvet. Osc. 23.

167 On a gold ring found at Isernia, and now believed to be in some private collection at Paris, first published by Dressel, Deutsch. Lit.-Zeitung, 1882, p. 1132, whence this text, also in a 'Catalogue des Objets d'art antiques... dépendant de la succession Alessandro Castellani et dont la vent aura lieu à Rome' (1884).

## stenis kalaviis | anagtiai diiviai | dunum deded

Neatly engraved in (probably archaic) Osc. a $\beta$ unrounded. Dressel gave diliv-, and in the Catalogue also he tells me the second $\mathbf{i}$ is $卜$, but we have $\mathbf{i}$ in both datives, and this thorn might be accidental. Dressel
ascribed the $a \beta$ to Sullan times, but I see no positive reason for as late a date; the absence of $\stackrel{\circ}{\mathbf{u}}$, and the absence or uncertain use of $\stackrel{i}{i}$ may be due either to archaism or to ignorance of Oscan aß.

For offerings of rings cf. C. I. L. II. 3386 (to Isis as here to Angitia). For Angitia, the Marsian healing goddess, see pp. 261, 289 f. inf.

Of Aesernia we know nothing until it became a Latin colony in 263 b.c. In the Social War it was taken and held for 10 years by the Allies (see the authorities cited and discussed by Mommsen C. I. L. Ix. p. 243), but I do not know any reason for referring the insc. to this brief space rather than to pre-Latin times.

Buicheler, Rhein. Mus. 36 (1882), p. 643, Zvet. Inscc. It. Infer. Dial. 107.

## 168-174. Inscriptions of Pietrabbondante (Bouianum Vetus).

There were two towns called Bouianum, 'colonia Bouianum uetus et alterum cognomine Undecinanorum' Plin. 3 § 107. The latter is certainly the modern Boiano (see C. I. L. IX. 2563 ff.), and took its cognomen from the Legio XI. which Vespasian settled there (ib. 2564); before this the town appears to have been a municipium (ib. 2563). The site of Bouianum uetus appears to be fixed by 171 inf . at Pietrabbondante, about a dozen miles to the N. of Boiano. This town, we learn from the Lib. Colon. (p. 231 Lachm.), was made into a colonia by veterans under the Lex Julia of 45 B.C.

Now Livy (9.31) calls one of the towns, we do not know which, 'caput Pentrorum Samnitium,' but Mommsen (U.D. p. 171) reasonably identifies it with the southernmost (Boiano), conjecturing ${ }^{1}$ that the other, Bouianum uetus, was the centre of the Caraceni Samnites whom we know (see Carecena regio 187 A inf.) to have lived in the northern part of Samnium. Some confirmation of this may be found in the present name of the hill on which the temple and theatre at Pietrabbondante stand, given by de Petra as varying between M. Caraceno and M. Saraceno ; the latter may conceivably be due to a popular connexion of the name with the Saracens (Italn. Saracini). In 217 b.c. we find a Samnite contingent of 8000 foot and 500

[^43]horse (Liv. 22. 24) under the command of one Numerius Decimius 'princeps genere ac diuitiis non Bouiani modo unde erat sed toto Samnio.'

The oldest Latin insc. of Pietrabbondante (if we except the obscure fragment in Note xxvii p. 255 inf., whose $a \beta$ points to some spot further N.) is C. I. L. X. $2770=\mathrm{I}^{1} 1278$, which dates from Ciceronian times, and I know of no reason why our series of inscc. should not reach down to that period ; spoken Oscan can hardly have died out before the Julian colony. The seven inscc. are here given in the order suggested by the character of their writing, which, as they are all of the same class-building-inscriptions-and from the same place, affords a very fair criterion : that of the two last (173-4) shows something of the finished style of the Cippus Abellanus (95), while even the most archaic inscc. have $\mathfrak{i}$ and $\mathfrak{u}$. Now we have seen (p.108) the full rectangular Oscan $a \beta$ fully established in Campania at least as soon as 268 B.C., and probably by the beginning of the 3rd century; so that even if we put the adoption of square writing fifty years later in Samnium than in Campania (we have $\exists$ beside $卜$ on Frentane coins of about 268, see p. 212) we can hardly date the oldest of the Pietrabbondante group later than 250 b.c. For some two centuries then, the only record we possess of the history of the towns lies in these seven fragmentary inscc. Felixne populus cuius nulla historia?

De Petra (Giorn. Scav. Pomp. n. s. 2, p. 117 ff.) has given an interesting account of the excavations carried out in 1857-8 and 1870 at Calcatello, the actual site of Bouianum Vetus, just S. of Pietrabbondante. The only buildings of importance whose remains were laid bare were a temple and a theatre, of which only the ground plan is visible ${ }^{1}$. Both stood on the eastern slope of a hill, the Monte Caraceno, the temple some fifty-five metres to the N . of the theatre. A special feature in the plan of the temple is that the statue of the deity, of which the base remains, did not stand as usual in the back of the cella, but on its N. side-wall, clearly, as de Petra points out, in order that the worshipper might not have to turn his back on the east

[^44](cf. Serv. ad Aen. 12. 172) when facing the deity. The altars in the temple-court are specially arranged with the same object.

Five of the seven inscc. come from the temple area, one from the neighbourhood of the theatre; whence the seventh (173) was taken, to be built into its present position, we do not know.

168 Found in the temple at Calcatello in 1857, and now in the Naples Museum, where I read it in April, 1894: Zvet. Osc. iv. 5 gives an unsatisfactory facsimile. Corssen, Ephem. Epigr. ii. 189, gives the reading of de Petra.

$$
\begin{array}{l|l}
\text { Etriib........ } & \text { is seemun[ar? } \mid \text { ?dat]sův } \\
\text { ehpreivid... } & \text { ninuseisp.d } \theta \theta \theta .
\end{array}
$$

On a very worn fragment of travertine roughly triangular in shape, $\cdot 42 \mathrm{~m}$. (17 in.) broad at its base; the right hand edge slopes outward slightly to a height of 305 m . ( 12 in .), and then more abruptly opposite the first line, where it projects about an inch further to the right, finally intersecting the left-band or longest side about $1 \frac{1}{2} \mathrm{in}$. above the first line. This space may once have held letters which are now broken or cut away; others have clearly been lost on the left, and possibly on the right, though, as ll. 2 to 4 begin from the same vertical line, it is possible that the first letter of 1. 1, which stands just to the right of this vertical, may have been the first of the whole insc. as in 11.1 and 4 of 42 sup. 1. 4 is certainly the last, since there is a clear margin beneath, whose surface is not broken away. The letters are $\cdot 035 \mathrm{~m}$. ( $1 \frac{1}{2} \mathrm{in}$.) high, and their cross strokes seem now and then to slope upwards to the left, though mostly horizontal; the interpunct is single.

1. 1 begins with a vertical prolonged upwards, close to, but much taller than the $\mathbf{g}$; the whole stroke may be accidental, if so read $\mathbf{g}$, else $\mathbf{k}$; of $\underline{\mathbf{b}}$ only the smallest corner is left. 2 is is dim, perhaps $\underline{n}$; ee looked to me more likely than eh ; the last letter read by previous editors was the $\mathbf{m}$, but the angle of $\mathbf{u}$ seemed to me clear, then $\boldsymbol{n}$ certain, then $\mathbf{a}, \mathrm{e}, \mathrm{h}$ or $\mathbf{v}$, then $\mathbf{r}$ or $\mathbf{b}$,-these two symbols were read lv by de Petra; should we restore seemunariiss, and compare for the form Lat. pomonal? 3 the supposed vertical before $\Sigma$ seemed to me almost too close for a letter; if it is, $\mathbf{t}$ is more likely than $\mathfrak{i} ; \mathfrak{\circ}$ more likely than $\mathbf{u}$ from the way the stone is broken ; on the edge $\boldsymbol{d}$ seemed to me fairly probable (with its loop
broken away). 4 Possibly ni (or mi) not, I think $h$, then nuseisp is clear, the next sign very doubtful, $\mathrm{a}, \mathrm{e}, \mathrm{i}, \mathrm{l}, \mathrm{h}$ seemed all possible; then d is clear: the next three signs which Corssen read hef have their corners all rounded like $\theta$; I conjecture they are simply that symbol three times repeated with a numeral value-so that the inse. contained some kind of measure : cf. 59 sup. and Note xxi p. 217 inf.; after them is a vertical with a fragment of a line at the bottom, possibly $\checkmark$ or $\vee$, though more like the bottom of $]$.

I add the following conjectural rendering, merely to show the nature of the insc.; it assumes that seemun- is not a native Oscan word (cf. iviveis meellikieis in 39 sup. with a similar ee): Gaius Trebius [ . . filius templum areamque numin]ibus Semonal[ibus de] sua re familiari [dedit ....agri *fru]minosi (i.e. fructuosi) pedes CCCL ....

Fabr. 2873 quater, Zvet. Osc. 21.

## 169 The Censor-Inscription of Bouianum Vetus.

Discovered in November, 1857, in the temple described above, and frequently published, but never accurately until by Pauli, in his Altital. Studien, ii. 78 ff ., from a plaster-cast and a paper-impression specially made for him by de Petra. Previous editors, even Bücheler, took the insc. to be complete, and not only translated it without hesitation, but scanned it as a Saturnian! It is now in the Naples Museum, where I saw it March 1894.

In full Osc. $a \beta$, the letters rectangular and boldly but regularly cut, about $1 \frac{1}{2} \mathrm{in}$. ( 042 m .) high, with single interpuncts ; the upper stroke of $\langle$ is always at the normal angle, the lower is once or twice almost horizontal; the cusps of $\mathbf{d}$ and $\mathbf{f}$ leave the loops open. The stone is a block of travertine now of irregular shape, with a straight base measuring 405 m .; its greatest height is 650 m . ( 16 in ., $25 \frac{1}{2} \mathrm{in}$.), and the left-hand edge is fairly vertical, but inclining to the right from 1. 2 to the top; the righthand inclines inwards slightly from the bottom up to 1.2 , and then bends sharply to the left. The original shape of the stone, and the number of letters missing have been most ingeniously determined by Pauli. The size of the different gaps in the text is measured according to his calculation. It is clear that every line began with a new word, as in 28,43 and many other inscc.

Pauli noticed that the upper margin ended in a few inches of smooth edge that seemed to be an arc of some curve, and by measurement found that it was part of a circle whose centre was in the base line, and that the highest point of the semicircle, subtended by that line produced, lay in this are, which, he reasonably concluded, was the summit of the tablet. Now the restoration of one letter to the beginning of each of 11. 6-9 (see below) is quite certain; it follows that that side, and therefore naturally the other also, for some height at least must have been a vertical straight line. Pauli now produced the straight edge of 11. $6-9$ as restored till it cut the circle, and this it did opposite the end of 1.2 , 533 m . (21 in.) above the base. It was a fairly certain inference that he bad now fully determined the shape and size of the complete tablet; namely, a rectangle 533 m . high and $737 \mathrm{~m} .{ }^{1}$ broad, surmounted by the are of a circle whose centre is the middle point of the rectangle's base, and radius the distance of that point from either of its upper corners. The first line of the insc. is within the tympanum beneath the are, the rest of the insc. covers the rectangle.

These points will I hope be clear by the aid of a figure.

$a b x y$ is the fragment preserved, $x y=\cdot 405 \mathrm{~m} ., a b$ is the small uninjured arc, $h$ its highest point, $c$ the centre of the circle, defg the complete rectangle. Then $c a=c h=c b=c e=\cdot 650 \mathrm{~m} .$, e $f=\cdot 533 \mathrm{~m}$. By Pauli's measurement $g f=\cdot 737 \mathrm{~m}$.

The stones of nos. 22 and 91 were somewhat similar in shape, and no. 39 may once have been.
${ }_{1}$ The geometrical construction by which the base $=2 \mathrm{CF}$

$$
=2 \sqrt{(C E)^{2}-(E F)^{2}}=2 \sqrt{(.650)^{2}-(\cdot 533)^{2}} \mathrm{~m} .=744 \mathrm{~m}
$$

shows that Pauli has allowed $\frac{\cdot 744-\cdot 735}{2}=\cdot 0035 \mathrm{~m}$., too little margin in the base, outside the right-hand edge of the insc.

The letters on the fragment preserved vary very much in breadth, but it will be found that they occupy on an average $\cdot 031 \mathrm{~m}$. If we allow $\frac{1}{2} \mathrm{in}$. ( 0125 m .) margin on either side, and 031 m . for the letters to be supplied on the right of 11. 6-9 and adopt Pauli's reckoning of 737 m . as the original length of the base, we have ( $\cdot 737-\cdot 405-\cdot 056=\cdot 276$ ) m. for the breadth of the engraved space lost on the left of those lines, that is, room for at least 8 letters, but as the margin may have been larger and the size of the letters varies greatly, it is safer to reckon 7 as the minimum missing there, and 8 in 1.2 where the edge is further broken. In 1.1 the curve of the stone allows only room for one letter on the right hand and 4 or 5 on the left.

## urtam liis..... | ...d safinim sak

......... | ..upam iak ůin....... | in]im

5 keenzstur....... | .aiieis maraiieis....... p]aam essuf umbn.......| a]vt půstiris esidu....... | duunated fiis....... | i i]nim
10 leigůss samip....... | .i̊vfrikůnůss fiff.......

1. 1 possibly $\stackrel{\mathfrak{u}}{ }$ as the top is lost; at the end there seems to be left the foot of a vertical. 2 no interp. after $\mathbf{d}$, which is therefore probably the end of a preposition. 4 ad fin. interpunct. 8 the tail of $\mathbb{d}$ is clearly preserved and it is too low down for either $\geqslant 1$ or $>$ to be very likely. 9 only the first hasta of $\mathbf{p}$ is left; it is not a but might perhaps be $\mathbf{n}$. 10 Nothing legible is left before $\stackrel{\circ}{\mathrm{u}}$.

Pauli's brilliant restoration must be substantially correct, and it certainly merits quotation in full, especially as his separation of the sentences is fairly certain; the beginning and end of 1.1 , the beginning of 1.3 , and the end of 11. 7, 8, and perhaps 9 appear to me doubtful, and without further evidence I cannot accept $f_{i}^{e} f_{i \imath k e d}^{e \ell}$ as the Osc. for fecit beside fefacust of $28,1.12$. For the meaning see the Glossary.
 tuovtio in] èm Keenzstur [uupsens M]aìieis Maraireiss [eitiuvad p]aam essuf ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{m} b n\left[{ }^{\ell} m\right.$ deded; $\left.a\right]$ pt pistiris esidu[m duunuim?] duunated, fius[nam deded?,


Pauli Altital. Stud. Hannover 1884 ii. 77-124. Earlier commentators are Bücheler, Rhein. Mus. 1875 p. 441, Corssen Ephem. Epig. ii. p. 189.

Fabr. 2872, Zvet. Osc. 17.

170 Found in the temple at Calcatello in 1857, now in the Naples Museum, and seen by me in March 1894; first edited by Minervini (Bull. Arch. Nap. n.s. vi. p. 190, vii. tab. II. 3).

## sten...........meddiss | tiov[tik]s ํㅡㄴsannam

## deded | inim průfatted

At the top of a block of travertine 22 in . high by 33 broad ( 555 by .820 m .) ; Osc. a $\beta$, in somewhat irregular letters 2 in . high ( 050 m .); the loops of $\mathbf{f}$ and $\mathbf{d}$ are open, $\mathbf{u}$ is $V$; interp. single. In 1.1 only the tip of the last $\mathbf{s}$ is left on the edge of the break, and it has been hitherto overlooked. 2 the lowest part of $\underline{\mathbf{S}}$ and $\underline{\underline{u}}$ are still clearly visible.

Fabr. 2873 bis, Zvet. Osc. 19.

171 Found in Calcatello in a field in front of the stage of the theatre (see above), and first published by Lepsius in 1841. Now in the Naples Museum, where I saw it, March 1884; facsim. Zvet. Osc. iii. 6.

## ny vesullia|is tr m t | ekik

## 4,5 sakara|klům bůva|ianůd

aikdafed
On a block of travertine 23 in . high, 11 broad ( 580 by $\cdot 265 \mathrm{~m}$.), in Osc. $a \beta$, with single interpuncts, the letters well cut, a little over 1 in . ( 030 m .) high. The loops of $\mathbf{b} d f$ are generally open, the upper and lower strokes of are nearly horizontal, and except for the ligatures the writing is identical with that of the preceding insc. 11. 2 and 5 are much shorter than the rest. In $t$ is a brief compendium for meddiss tuivtiks as in 109 sup.

The reading is certain throughout, save that $\underline{u}$ in 1.1 might be $\mathfrak{i}$, (I have left Mommsen's reading, though ${ }_{\mathrm{U}}$ is perhaps more probable). What seems to have been an insc. of 5 or 6 lines has been intentionally effaced on the stone above this, and the chisel marks of erasure run the whole length of the stone.

The insc. is important, as it seems to give us the ancient name of Pietrabbondante, namely, in its Latin form, Bouianum (Vetus), see p. 183 sup.
U. D. p. 171, Fabr. 2874, Zvet. Osc. 15.

172 Found in 1857, in the temple at Calcatello on four fragments of a handsome cornice of soft tufa projecting 9 in .; three of the fragments are now in the Naples Museum, where I saw them in March 1894, but the first was lost in Samnium. Zvet. Osc. iv. 2; for the lost fragment, Minervini, Bull. Arch. Nap. n.s. vii. tab. II. 2.
> [t staiis t]....[e]kak ups.... ded esidum prufatted

Well cut in Osc. $a \beta$, but with $Y$ for $\mathbf{u}$; the loop of $\mathbf{d}$ is open; but the letters generally show more finish than in the preceding insc.; interp. single, apparently omitted after ded. How much has been lost in the first two gaps we cannot tell. The third break comes in the $\mathfrak{u}$ of prufatted, which may have been $\stackrel{\circ}{\mathrm{u}}$. The three fragments now measure 5 ft .4 in . by 14 ( 1.610 by 360 m .), the letters 070 m . high. On Minervini's fragment only the upper third of the letters was left, -iis therefore may have been IIs. Pauli (Neue Philolog. Rundschau, 1887, p. 123) reads esidum, but $i$ is quite certain. The rest is clear.

Fabr. 2873, Zvet. Osc. 18.

173 On two blocks of limestone built into the walls of the church of S. Maria at Pietrabbondante, first published by Caraba, Bull. Arch. Nap. iii. p. 11; the text is from excellent impressions kindly sent me by Prof. de Nino in July 1894.
> a....$d$ staatiis 1 klar...
> b. $\quad$..d pestli̊m ůpsann...

The letters belong to the best period of Osc. writing, and show signs of the broadening of the ends of strokes, which is so marked an embellishment in the Cippus Abellanus (95); they are bold and regular, $2 \frac{1}{2} \mathrm{in}$. (. 062 m .) high ; the loop of $d$ is closed, the interpunct single. In (a) only the tail of $\underset{\underset{d}{d}}{ }$ is left, but it is too long for $\mathbf{k}(\underset{1}{ })$, and, I think, for Zvet.'s $\mathbf{g}$; aa are injured but clear. We have no means of telling how much is lost before and after each line.

[^45]174 Found in 1857 in the temple at Calcatello, and now in the Naples Museum, where I saw it in March 1894. Zvet. Osc. iii. 7 gives photograph.

## gn stails mh tafidins metd t dadikatted

On six fragments of travertine, once part of the cornice of some public building, 460 m . high, and together $5 \cdot 1 \mathrm{~m}$. long ( 19 in . by 17 ft .), put together by Minervini (Bull. Arch. Nap. n.s. vi. 188). The letters are huge, $\cdot 200 \mathrm{~m}$. (8 in. high) and handsomely cut; they must have stood at some height from the ground. The loop of $d$ is always closed, those of $f$ nearly so. The interpunct is a star. De Petra (Giorn. Pomp. l.c.) regards this as the dedication of the whole temple, and concludes that it is of earlier date than the other four inscc. found there (v. sup.) ; but this does not follow, especially in the case of a building erected, as this clearly was, in several portions. The finished style of the writing seems to me to show that it is the latest of them all. On metd see Conway, Am. Journ. Phil. xı. 307.

Fabr. 2872, Zvet. Osc. 16.

175-176 Inscriptions from Agnone.
We have no trace of any ancient town in this neighbourhood save Bovianum Vetus, but there appears to have been a vicus of sorne size on the site of the modern village of Schiavi, near Agnone (C. I. L. IX. p. 257).

## 175 Tabula Agnonensis.

A small tablet of bronze with a handsome handle and chain for hanging, found at Agnone in 1848, now in the Brit. Museum, where I compared it with the text in September 1892. Photograph of slightly reduced size, Zvet. Osc. ii.
a. statůs pios set hi̊rtin/kerriiin; vezkei statif|evklůi statif kerri statif | futrei kerriaiai 5,6 statif | anterstatai statif | ammai kerriiai statif | diumpais kerriais statif | liganakdikei entrai

9, 10 statif | anafriss kerriiuis statif | matuiis kerriiuiis statif | diůvei verehasiůi statif | diůveí regaturei statif|hereklůi kerriiůi statif | patanai 15,16 piistiai statif | deivai genetai statif. | aasai purasiai | saahtiom tefůrum alttrei | půtereipid akenei | sakahiter.

20-22 fiuusasiais az hůrtům | sakarater; | pernaí kerriiai statif | ammai kerriai statif | fluusai 25 kerriiai statif | evklůi paterei statif.
b. aasas ekask eestint|hůrtůi; |

3-7
vezkei | evklưi | fuutrei | anterstatai | kerri | 8-11 ammail | diumpais | liganakdikei entrai | kerriai; |
anafriss | matiois | diůvei verehasiưi* 15,16 diůvei piihiůi regaturei | hereklui kerriiůi | patanai piistiai | deivai genetail aasai purasiai | 20-22 saahtům tefirům | alttrei putereipid | akenei; | hůrz dekmanniuis stait.

The bronze is carefully engraved on both sides in full Oscan $\alpha \beta$, and measures 11 in . by $6 \frac{1}{2}$ ( 28 by 165 m .) ; the letters vary from $\frac{1}{2}$ to $\frac{1}{4} \mathrm{in}$. in height, but in any one line the size is constant. The interpunct is single and never omitted ; after 1.19 of $(\alpha)$ and 11.2 and 11 of $(b)$ there is a short horizontal line drawn from the right margin inwards. Every letter is perfectly clear and certain, but in (b) they are far less carefully formed. On both sides however the smooth surface of the bronze has caused many slips of the stilus so that the letters seem rough and jagged when compared with those cut in stone, and this must be taken into account in estimating their age. But in $\mathbf{e}, \mathbf{f}$ and h the projection of the vertical at one end or other is too constant to be accidental; their cross strokes and that of $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ have an unmistakeable slope upwards, parallel to the thorn of $\mathbf{i}$, which slopes downwards to the right, while at least half the verticals slope to the left downwards. Add to this that the loops of $\mathbf{d}$ and $\mathbf{f}$ are
regularly open, the top stroke of $p$ is slanting ( $\Pi$ not $\Pi$ ), and the top and bottom of $s$ very nearly horizontal. These characteristics are enough, I think, to give the insc. a place among the earliest in which the full Osc. $a \beta$ is employed.

The construction and punctuation of the sentences is hardly open to doubt, except in (b) 3-18, where the datives vezkel.....genetai might belong to what precedes (aasas eestint) or to what follows them (saahtů mefůrum), if they were all taken together. The engraver however broke them into two groups by the paragraph mark between 11. 11 and 12, and I can find no definite reason to suppose him mistaken. If he were, the stop at 1.11 must be moved to 1.18.
(a) 1. 5 and (b) 1.6 interp. after anter as commonly after a preposition in a compound. (a) 20 fiuus- is probably an error for fluus- (| for $\sqrt{ }$ ), as in (b) 14 -siu certainly is for -siuil (cf. a 11), and (b) 16 -riiui̊ for -riiui. But the difference between piistiai ( $\alpha$ 14, $b 17$ ) on the one hand and the terminations -asiai, -asiui and -anniuis on the other must, I think, imply a difference of sound; cf. now von Planta Osk-Umbr. Gramm. p. 169 and § 85 generally.

Buicheler Umbrica 30, 80, 112, Momms. U. D. p. 128, Aufrecht K. Z. II. 90, Bréal, Mém. Soc. Ling. Paris Iv., 138. Zvet. Osc. 9, Fabr. 2875.

Found in 1845 in the ruins of a rectangular building at le Macchie a mile from Agnone, now in the Naples Museum where I saw it in March, 1894; photograph in Zvet. Osc. iii. 1, but Mommsen's facsimile U.D. viii. 7 gives the shape of the colonnette better, though his engraving of the insc. does not reproduce the letters exactly.

## $m z$ hůrtiis $k m$ her důnům

Round the neck of a round column of travertine now 3 m . high, with a diameter of 130 m . ( $12 \mathrm{in} ., 6 \mathrm{in}$.) measured across the capital which is immediately over the insc. ; the column presumably was a pedestal for a small image, since the top is slightly hollowed and has two small holes. The letters are restangular and well finished, in Osc. a $\beta, 020 \mathrm{~m} .\left(\frac{3}{4} \mathrm{in}\right.$.) high, with single interpunct; the loop of $\mathbb{d}$ is open. The words completely encircle the stone, but the beginning of the sentence is shown by the fairly large intervals between the letters of mz h irtiis compared with the crowding in the last word whose last $m$ is so close to the $m$ of $m x$ that there is no room for an interpunct, and the last $\mathbf{I I}$ is very narrow.

The reading is perfectly certain, and only the fact that the praenomen mz (appearing in an insc. only recently discovered, 48 sup.) was unknown can have prevented earlier editors from recognising it.
U. D. p. 174, Fabr. 2876, Zvet. Osc. 10.

## 177-180 Inscriptions of Aufidena.

Aufidena was taken by the Romans in 298 B.c. (Liv. 10.12) and seems to have remained a municipium (C. I. L. IX. p. 259). The Roman road from Aesernia to Sulmo crosses the Sangrus at Castel di Sangro, and the Lat. insc. (ib. 2802) recording the building of the bridge cannot be later than Sulla.

Found in Castel di Sangro, an ancient vicus and modern town not far from the ancient Aufidena (mod. Alfidena) ; first published by Guarini in 1831, now in the Naples Museum, where I saw it in March, 1894; photograph Zvet. Osc. iii. 2.

## pk de pk sůvad | eitiv upsed

In regular Osc. $a \beta$ of a fairly modern type, the letters $2 \frac{1}{4} \mathrm{in}$. ( 055 m .) high, with single interp., on a block of travertine, now greatly worn, 3 ft . long (the insc. covering only 2 ft . on the right) by 8 in . high; the odd foot is quite undressed and was probably imbedded in the wall. 1. 1 Pauli (Neue Philol. Rundschau 1887, p. 123) reads suvad but the punct is quite certain though rather high. $2 \nabla$ has a slight stroke in the middle, so that it appears like e, but I believe it to be accidental because it is not equal in length to the other two arms, whereas the three arms are equal in the three certain examples of $\mathbf{e}$. At the end is an accidental mark in the stone, formerly and certainly wrongly read as $\mathbf{V}$.
U. D. p. 171, Fabr. 2877, Zvet. Osc. 11.

178 Found in Barrea ${ }^{1}$ near Aufidena and now in Alvito; first published (incompletely) by Garrucci, Bull. Arch. Nap. n. s. II. (1854), p. 165; the text is from an impression kindly sent me by de Nino in July, 1894. Zvet. gives ■ photograph of a cast taken by Mommsen in 1876.


The stone is greatly injured; 1l. 1 and 2 end with the interpunct some way from the left-hand edge, so that these lines and possibly also I. 3 have lost nothing on this side; p]růfat.. is regular at the end of builder's inscc. so that 1.5 must be the last. Space must have been lost for

[^46]one or two words on the right of each line, and for five letters at the end of 4 and 5 .

The letters are 1 in . ( 028 m .) high, and present noteworthy features; $\dot{u}$ is $\dot{Y}, \boldsymbol{a}$, the loops of $d$ and $f$ open, the top and bottom of nearly horizontal, the cross-strokes of $\mathbf{e}, \mathbf{V}$ and i quite so; interp. double. 1.1 s is clear, followed by the interp. ( Zv . gives k ). 2 begins with the lower halves of 2 or 3 letters, mp and $\mathrm{mi}^{\circ}$ are equally possible. 3 V is fairly clear, but might be possibly $\mathbf{d}$ or $\mathbf{p}$; of the final 1 only the top of the vertical is left. $\quad 5$ before $p$ seems to be the upper half of $I$ and then an interp.

Biicheler, Bull. Inst. Arch. Rom. 1876, p. 207, Fabr. 2870, Zvet. Osc. 12.

179, 180 Found in the same place and published by exactly the same authorities as the preceding insc. The text is given from excellent impressions sent me by de Nino. Zvet. (from Mommsen) Osc. iii. 4 and 5.

179 mahiis

180


Both 179 and 180 are on fragments of stone broken all round; the first is $\cdot 150 \mathrm{~m}$. long, the letters $\cdot 03 \mathrm{~m}$. high. In 179 a is A , and the two lower strokes of 1 are clear. 180 is larger with letters 039 m . high, rudely cut, the crossstrokes not quite parallel, and that of 1 sloping downwards; the last sign is $\Gamma /$ and as the oblique stroke clearly does not join the vertical, I think it must be $\mathbf{p}$. With it was a third chip, not fitting on to the second anywhere, but with letters of the same height, $\mathbf{i}$ above $\mathbf{S}$.

Fabr. 2884 and 2887, Zvet. Osc. 12 and 13.

181 Said to have been purchased in Samnium, but since 1832 in the Naples Museum, where I saw it, March 1894. Zvet. Osc. v. 7, Mom. U. D. viII. 11.

$$
\text { mitl me|tiis mh } \mid \text { fml ups }
$$

Across the top of a carved table-leg 69 m . high by 104 broad ( 27 in . by 4 ), in Osc. $\alpha \beta$ with single interpunct. Previous editors read fiml, but the thorn to the right of $m$ is very minute if it is there at all, and I took it to be certainly a tiny break in the stone; there is more reason for reading
-tiis in 1. 2, but there also I believe the break is accidental, and the same is true of a diagonal stroke at the foot of the t in the same line J (? tl ). fml seems simply an abbreviation for famel (see 205 A inf.).
U. D. p. 126, Fabr. 2885, Zvet. Osc. 29.

## 182-185 Coins of Samnium.

Telesia, Allifae and Aesernia all lie a little to the East of the valley of the Volturnus, which for a long distance separates Samnium from Campania; but from the numismatic standpoint they should hardly be separated from Compulteria and Venafrum, which lie West of the valley; that is, they are equally a branch of the Campanian group.

Telesia.
This town is first heard of in the Hannibalic war (Liv. 22. 13, 217 в.c. and 24. 20, 214 B.c.) and became later on a Roman colony, but not before Sulla; see Mommsen, C. I. L. IX. p. 205.

## telis

Rare bronze coins after 268 B.c. with the later type of Pallas-head ) cock. Head p. 25. Zvet. (Osc. 168), following Fiorelli, wrongly tedis.

Friedl. O. M. p. 6, Head p. 69, U. D. p. 200.

Allifae.

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { a. } \alpha \lambda \lambda \iota \beta \alpha \nu \circ \nu & \text { d. } a \lambda \lambda \epsilon \iota \\
\text { b. all८ } \beta a & \text { e. } \alpha \lambda \lambda \iota f \alpha \nu \omega \nu \\
\text { c. al८фha } & \text { f. alifa }
\end{array}
$$

Silver coins in Ionic and Oscan $a \beta$; ( $\alpha$ ) is in pure Ion. $\alpha \beta$ from left to right; (b) and (c) are in the same direction but have $L=\lambda$ (is this Chalcidian, and therefore pre-Euclidian, or (more probably) simply Oscan ?); (c) has $-\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{H}=\mathrm{f}^{1}$, while (e) has the Osc. 8 for which the B of $(a)$ and (b) must be an inexact equivalent, for there is no possibility of a Latinised

[^47]form at the date of these coins. (d) and (e) have $\wedge=\lambda,(d)$ is retrograde, (e) from left to right, $(f)$ in Osc. $a \beta$ but from left to right. (e) is taken from Mommsen U. D. p. 106, confirmed by the reading W 8 NOH on several specimens found by Dressel, which must be the Greek engraver's abbreviated version of the Oscan NLLI8NHOH. The types are as follows:
(1) Head of Apollo wreathed )(Scylla and shell; litrae and perhaps obols, weighing from $\cdot 77$ to $\cdot 55$ grammes, with the legend ( $\alpha$ ).
(2) Head of Pallas )( Scylla and shell; the same, with (b) and (e).
(3) Head of Pallas )(Campanian bull; didrachm with (c).
(4) Oyster shell )( the symbol $\asymp$; half-obol with (d).
(5) lion's head $)\left(\Varangle\right.$; the same, with $(f)^{1}$.

Head (p. 26) dates them all from $400-350$ b.c., but see the note below on the coins of Phistelia.

Mommsen (U. D. p. 105, C. I. L. IX. p. 214 n.) placed the site of this Allifae close to Cumae on the modern M. Ollibano (or Olevano?), and distinguished it altogether from the better known town of the same name in Samnium, on the left bank of the Volturnus, v. infr. no. 187 A, on the grounds that these coins did not come from that site, and that there were no silver coins from Samnium of any sort, both of which are now finally set aside by Dressel's discovery of seven examples of (1) and (2), one by one, in the mouths of the dead in an ancient cemetery known as the Conca $d^{\prime}$ oro at Piedmonte $d^{\prime \prime}$ Alife near Alife (Allifae) itself, along with a great number of Fistelian coins; see his essay in Histor. u. Philolog. Aufsätze, Ernst Curtius gewidmet 1884, p. 247 ff ., where he rejects as inaccurate the older accounts of the appearance of these coins in Campania.

Zvet. Osc. 167, Momm. U. D. pp. 105, 201, Head p. 26, Beschr. Berl. p. 72, Poole p. 73, Friedl. O. M. p. 25.

[^48]
## Fistelia.

u. fistlus
b. fistelư
d. fistlůis)(upsiis
e. $\phi \iota \sigma \tau \epsilon \lambda \iota \alpha$ )(fistluis
c. fistluis

Silver, older Osc. and Gr. (Ion.) $a \beta,(\alpha)$ and one specimen of (c) from left to right, the rest retrograde: the most archaic coins of this part of Italy, dated by Head (p. 35) from 420-400 b.c., but see below. $\mathfrak{u}$ is $V$, and the fact that it is not used in upsiis shows, perhaps, that it was an innovation which had not affected the spelling of personal names. In $(b) \mathbf{e}$ is $\geqslant$. The types are as follows:
(1) Head of Hera, with necklace and loose, wild-looking hair ( Campanian bull above a dolphin. Didrachms with the legend ( $\alpha$ ).
(2) Woman's head with loose hair, and fillet )(Campanian bull alone. Didrachms with the legend (c).
(3) The same head )( lion walking. Obols without legend constantly found with the coins of Phistelia and Allifae.
(4) Young head, rudely drawn, with no neck )( barley-corn, mussel and dolphin. These are
(i) obols with legend (c), in both directions, and (e) with the Oscan retrograde and the Greek from left to right; others without the dolphin and with no legend.
(ii) One or two litrae ( $\cdot 70,625$ gramme) with (c), Dressel l.c., and one ( $\cdot 783$ gramme) with (e), Poole p. 123.
(5) Pallas-head in helmet with owl and olive-wreath )( half a Campanian bull, with the legends (b) and (c); the weight of the coins is not given, but their size is stated by Friedländer (p. 32) and Minervini (Bull. Arch. Nap. n. s. III. p. 152) respectively as $1 \frac{1}{2}$ and 5 in Mionnet's scale, i.e. 11 and 21 millimetres, so that they are probably obols and didrachms.
(6) Similar head to (4), (in some specimens wreathed) with the neck slightly indicated )( the symbol $工$. Half-obols (from $325^{1}$ to $\cdot 25$ gramme) with (c) and (d).
(7) The same head wreathed)(star of four rays with a point between each two. Only one specimen, but well preserved (weighing 15 gramme and therefore a quarter obol), with (c), though as the $\mathfrak{u}$ is damaged the ending may have been -u is as in ( $d$ ).

[^49]This table is compiled from Friedländer (Osk. M. Tab. v., p. 28), Dressel (Hist. u. Philol. Aufsütze, Ernst Curtius gewidmet 1884, p. 249), Head p. 35, Poole p. 122 and Berl. Beschr. p. 95.

Mommsen (U. D. p. 106, but cf. Monn. Rom. 工. p. 161 n.) followed Friedländer and others in identifying Fistelia with Puteoli, but the question of its site has been greatly simplified by Dressel's discovery (v. supra) of a large number of Fistelian coins in the Conca d' oro. 23 of them had legends, and there were seven others with the third of the types given above. All other recent discoveries of these coins have been made in Samnium, not in Campania, and Dressel rejects as untrustworthy the statements formerly current as to their appearance in Naples. Sign. Stevens of Naples states that one and only one example has ever been found in the necropolis of Cumae, and none in that of Puteoli. They have always been in company with coins of Allifae, and Fistelia must have been very near that town. For further conjectures as to its identity see Dressel l. c. p. 253 ff., and Garrucci Mon. d. Ital. Antica p. 93 f. ${ }^{1}$

It must be observed that if the coins are Samnite, not Campanian, their archaic character would scarcely vouch for so early a date as 400 b.c. But (1) since there are no bronze coins from these towns, the silver coins are very probably older than 350 в.c. (Mommsen, Monn. Rom. I. p. 165), and (2) the fact that the earlier specimens are obols, not litrae, together with (3) the absence of the drachma, ranks them with the oldest series of Campanian coins (id. ib. p. 162 f.), represented e.g. by the coins of Cumae, which cease at 420 b.c., or the earliest coins of Naples (Head p. 31 f.) from $420-400$ в.c. All the same, the progress of the inland towns must have lagged considerably behind that of the cities on the coast, and it is not safe to transfer the dates of the various changes in coinage from the one locality to the other without allowing a reasonable interval.

Zvet. Osc. 178.

Aesernia.

## a. aisernio

## b. uolcanom ) ( aisernim

c. uolcanom ) ( aisernino (sometimes aisern) and uolcanom alone.

## d. aisernino

Lat. $a \beta$ with $\wedge,\langle$ and $C, E$, always $L,\langle \rangle$, later $O, 5$ and sometimes $ट$. (a) is written in both directions, the rest from left to right.
${ }_{1}$ Where other readings of the legends are given which are extremely doubtful. Garrucci's long discussion of the coins of both towns appears to have been written without any knowledge of Dressel's discovery.
(b) is on two coins from different dies and therefore certain; some of the examples of (c) have aiserninom Avellino, Opusc. 2. 15. 159, Mom. U.D. p. 338. (d) which would seem pure Latin, curiously has the retrograde d as in the Osc. aß. To these Mom. U. D. p. 338 adds coins found at Rapino with desernium and aesernino (pure Latin) without describing their types.

Bronze coins, later than the foundation of the Roman colony in 263 b.c.
Types : (a) head of Pallas helmeted) (eagle clutching a serpent.
(b) and (c) head of Vulcan in conical hat, with tongs )( Zeus thundering, in a biga.
(d) head of Apollo laureate) (Campan. bull.
C. I. L. I. 20, Poole p. 67, Head p. 24, Beschr. Berl. p. 53, Friedl. Osk. M. p. 23, Zvet. Osc. 166.

## 186 Glosses assigned to the Samnites ${ }^{1}$.

## A. Glosses whose form is well attested.

hirpo- 'lupus.'
Irpini appellati nomine lupi quem irpum dicunt Samnites; eum enim ducem secuti agros occupauere. Paul. ex Fest. 106, Müll. So Strab. 5. 4. 2 (\%отоע); Serv. ad Aen. 11. 785 calls it (hirpo-) 'Sabine.'

## multa- 'poena.'

Fest. 142 M. Multam Osce dici putant poenam quidam. M. Varro ait poenam esse sed pecuniariam, de qua subtiliter in 1. 1 Quaestionum Epist. refert. Varro ap. Gell. 11. 1. 5 refers it to Samnitium lingua, and infers that it was originally Sabine and thence passed into Roman use.

## D. Doubtful Gloss.



 Corssen, Ausspr. $\mathrm{I}^{2}$. p. 450, but the ancient derivation from piryvvpu (Verrius ap. Fest. 270 M.) seems more probable for a Greek town founded in 743 b.c. [Regium on the Via Aemilia (C. I. L. xr. p. 173 footn.) was probably founded in 187 B.c. by M. Aemilius Lepidus, and the name is no doubt pure Latin, see Mom. C. I. L. l.c.] In judging the gloss of Eustathius it is hard to say whether the quite unparalleled form ${ }_{\rho}$ é $夭 \in s$ is a mark of corruption or genuineness.
${ }^{1}$ It seems desirable to give these under a separate heading, but of the glosses given simply as 'Oscan' (205 inf.) any number may be Samnite.

## 187 Place-names ${ }^{1}$ in Samnium $^{2}$.

A. Well attested (in form, date and locality).

Samnĭum, -nītes £avvîrau cl. inscc. Săbellí cl. e.g. Plin. 3.12. 107, Serv. ad Georg. 2. 167, cf. 310 (Sabini) A inf. For an ancient derivation of the name see Paul. ex Fest. 327 M.
Telesia, -sinus ( $\mathrm{T} \epsilon \mathrm{\lambda} \epsilon \sigma-$ ) cl. inscc. cf. 182. Telese.
Pentri cl., occupying the S. half of Samnium, with Bovianum Undecimanorum as their chief town, see p .183 sup.
Bouianum Undecimanorum, -uianenses cl. inscc. Boiano.
*Folianenses (-sis Fortuna C. I. L. ix. 2131). Foglianise.
Allīfae, -anus cl. inscc. (where always Alli-, but mss. often Ali-); for its locality see note to 183 supr. Alife.
Volturnus fl. cl. insc., adj. -nus, -nalis cl. Volturnof.
Saepinum, -nates cl. inscc. Sepino.
Tifernus mons Liv. 10. 30, -nus $\ddagger$ l. cl., -num oppidum Liv. Bifernof.
Aesernǐa, -ninus cl. inscc. ef. 185 supr. Isernia.
Fagifulae Pl. 3. 12. 107, cf. Liv. 24. 20, and Mom. C. I. L. ix. p. 237. S. M. a Faifoli (Kiep.).

Carecina regio Tac. Hist. 4. 5. Kapaknooi Ptol. 3. 1. 57 (who attributes them to Aufidena), -pikcuot Zonaras 8. 7, II. p. 51 Wolf, see p. 183 sup. and ? cf. the Kpauóves given as a Samnite tribe by Scylax (C inf.) and the

Cluuiae cl., C. I. L. Ix. 2999, where see Mom.
Bouianum uetus cl. inscc. Osc. Bůvaian-171 sup.
Aufidena, -enates cl. inscc. (mss. sometimes Afid-, inscc. always Auf- cf. Mom. C. I. L. Ix. p. 259). Alfedena.
Teruentum, Tereuentum inscc. -tinates Pl.3.12.107. Trivento.

[^50]
## B. Less certain.

Cominium Liv. 10. 39-43, Cominium Ocritum (alii Ceritum) id. 25. 14. ? Cerreto Sannita.
Aquilonia ? Liv. 10. 38-43, distinct from Aquilonia in Hirpinis, v. Mom. C. I. L. ix. p. 89. ? Montaquila.
Municipium Vicentinum C. I. L. Ix. 2565.
Duronia Liv. 10. 39. ? Cf. Durone f. (Dict. Cor.).
Trinium fl. v. 197 (Frentant) B.
之áyoos fl. v. 197 (Frentant) B.

## C. Doubtful.

Murgantia Liv. 10. 17.
Ferentinum ibid.
Cimetra Liv. 10. 15.
Imbrinium Liv. 8. 30.
Amiternum? Liv. 10. 39.
Feritrum ? Liv. 10. 34.
Palumbinum

| Velia | Liv. 10. 45. |
| :--- | :--- |

Herculaneum
Callifae? Liv. 8. 25. ?Calvisi or Carife. If the latter, it should be put under Hirpini.
Ficolenses Pl. 3. 12. 107.
חáv $\boldsymbol{0}$ a Stra. 5. 4. 11.
Sirpium Itinn.
Cluturnum? Tab. Peut. (between Telesia and Aesernia).
Mucrae or Nucrae? Sil. 8. 566.
Cesennia or Cens-Liv. 9. 44, $\Sigma \in \rho$ - Diod. Sic. 20. 90 ad fin. describing the same event.
Kívja Diod. Sic. 19. 76. 2.
ad Pyrum Tab. Peut.
[ad Canales Tab. P.]
Trebula? C. I. L. ix. 2823 v. Momms. ad loc.


 coast, passed in half-a-day's sail, between Paestum and Naples, and are therefore reasonably identified with the (Nucerini) Alfaterni. The remainder (cf. Carecina regio in A sup.) denote no doubt the Capuans, Samnites, Frentani and Bantines. Momms. U. D. p. 110 with n., von Planta Osk.-Umb. Gram. p. 17.

## D. Further modern names.

Montagna del Matese, Scapoli, Molise, Tappino f., Vandra f. (Kiep.), Cerro al Volturno, Limosano, Agnone.

## 188 Personal names of the Samnites.

## A. Frequent.

1. Nomina.

| Abullia | Floria | Oppidia |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Acilia | Foruiria | Orbia |
| Aedia | Fufidia | Ouia |
| Aemilia | Heluia sup. | Papia |
| Appuleia (once Apu-) | Herennia | Pomponia |
| Atinia sup. | Iulia | Pontia |
| Badia | Licinia | Raia (once Rahia) |
| Baebia | Luccia (3 Lucc-, 4 | Saepinia |
| Cassia | Luc-) | Satria cf. inf. |
| Cattia | Manlia | Seppia (once Sepia) |
| Claudia | Maria | Staia(once Staiia)sup. |
| Decitia | Munatia | Titia |
| Ennia | Naeuia | Trebellia |
| Epidia | Neratia | Varia |
| Fabia | Numisia cf. inf. | Vibia (once Vip-) inf. |
| Fadia | Nummia | Volceia |
| Flauia | Ofillia (once -ilia) |  |

2. Among the Cognomina may be mentioned

Ianuarius $l$. Proculus Rufus Rufinus

## B. Less frequent.

1. Nomina.

Accia
Acellia (once, and once Acc-)
Aebutia
Aelia
Aesernina
Afinia
Afrania
Agria
Alfia
Annia
Antracia (one insc.)
(Aproniana)
Apscillana (one insc.;
all L. of same man)
Aquillia (twice -ilia, twice -illia)
Arria
Arruntia (once Aru-)
Asellia
Atilia
Attia
Auidia
Auillia (Auil- twice, Auill- twice)
Aulena
Aurelia
Bassaea (twice -ea, once -aea)
Bouia
Bumbria
Caecilia
Caesena
Caesia
Calidia
Camudena (one insc.)
Casidia
Celeria
Centia
Cerrinia
Clodia

2. Among the Cognomina.

Aprilis
Apronianus
Caepulus
Cerialis
Corenthus

Dapne (-phn-)
Fodilla
Naso
Rufillus
Rufio $l$.

Salvius $l$.
Saturninus, serv.
Serpicanus
Sucrinus
Sulla
C. Once only.

1. Nomina.

Acria
Ahernia
Ahia
Albana
Aletia
Alitia
Alliena
Amatia
Ambilia
Amia
Anteia
Antestia
Antonia
Asuuia $l$.
Atulena
Auena
Aurunculeia
Autonia
Betia
Blaia
Blattia
Bottia
Caedia
Caia
Calpurnia
Catellia?
Cincia
Clouatia sup.
Coesia
Cosentia
Decria
Deiia l.

Dexia
Didia
Duillia
Eppia
Faecenia
Faesasia
Fladia
Fudia 7.
Fuficia
Fuluia
Fundania
Gauinia (i.e. Gab-)
Gauella
Gauillia
Gauolena?
Gellia
Grania
Gricia?
Grottonia?
Gullia?
Hatreia
Heia
Heria
Hirria
Holstilia?
Hostilia
Iauolena?
Iunia
Laberia
Longinia
Lusia

Mamia
Marcilia
Menia (i.e. Maen-)
Mettia sup.
Minia inf.
Modia
Modioleia
Mulleia
Mummia
Munatuleia $l$.
Mussidia
Ninnia inf.
Occia
Ofellia $l$.
Orfia
Pacia
Papiria
Paria
Percennia
Petreia $l$.
Pettia
Plautia
Plinia
Polia
Pontidia
Popillia
Prosia
Purellia
Quintilia
Rauial.

Romaea
Ronia?
Rubria
Rullia
Salonia
(Sarciana)
Scutarial.
Septumuleia
Seria
Sextia
Sontia
Sossulena
Statilia
Stertinia

Aeschinus $l$.
Bassus
Burianus
Camillus
Dama
Frestana
Iuinus

Sueleia $l$.
Suellia
Suetial.
Sufia
Suitia
Taddia
Taminia
Tamudia
Teia
Teltonia
Terentia
Teruentinia
Trebelliena
Tuccia
2. Among the Cognomina.

| Marullina |
| :--- |
| Mesus |
| Pansa |
| Polla |
| Pupus praen. |
| Specula |
| Spurius |

Varisidia
Vateria
Vergilia
Versinia?
Verulanal.
Vespicia
Vetidia
Vipsania
Visellia
Vistuleia
Vitoria $l$.
Volcacia
Volusia $l$.
Vsidia

Tatianus
Turpa $l$.
Turpio
Vettilla
Vibius praen.
Volsianus
Vrsulus
3. Frentani.

This tribe is first mentioned in the years 305-4 B.C. (Liv. 9 , cc. 16 and 40 ad fin.) when they entered the Roman alliance after the capture of what was then their chief town Frentrum (see 196). This either changed its name or perished some time after the middle of the 3rd century B.c. when it was issuing coins of its own (196) with an Oscan legend. There were no Latin colonies nearer than Hatria in Vestinian territory N. of the Aternus (cf. 373 A inf.), Alba Fucens away to the East, and Luceria founded in N. Apulia in 314 b.c. The latter, which was the nearest, affected the Frentane town of Larinum soon enough to make Latin its official language at least by 200 B.C. (195 inf. and cf. 30 b), but it is quite probable that in Frentanum
proper, as in the Paelignian hills, the native speech held its own for another century.

Larinum lay S. of Frentane territory (which ended at the Tifernus, Plin. 3, § 103), and hence its people are often distinguished (e.g. Plin. l.c., Caesar B. C. 1. 23) from the rest of the Frentani, to whom however they belonged by race (Plin. ib., Ptol. 3. 1. 65̈). The coins from the two towns show that they were independent, and those of Larinum, as we have seen, give us a useful criterion of date. From subsequent Lat. inscc., the earliest of which are of Sullan times (e.g. C. I. L. Ix. 726), as well as from the pro Cluentio passim (e.g. § 11), we learn that itwas a municipium (cf. C. I. L. IX. p. 69) ; it must have joined the Roman alliance at least some time before it adopted Latin speech, and almost certainly not later than the great Romanising epoch at the end of the war with Pyrrhus.

For Histonium and Anxanum, see the notes to 190 and 193.

189 In 1838 belonged to a Count Ricci as a family-possession; now in the small but interesting Museo Comunale of Vasto, where I saw it in April 1894; facsim. Zvet. Osc. i. 4 a from an impression by Dressel.


## b. ...sum..

On an irregular fragment of bronze $\cdot 055$ by $\cdot 046 \mathrm{~m}$. the letters $\cdot 009 \mathrm{~m}$. high in regular Osc. a $\beta$, except that the thorn of $i$ slants downwards and the arms of e vary in both directions from the horizontal; how much is lost all round it is impossible to say. 1.2 the first letter has lost its top and might be $\mathbf{i g}$, but not $\mathbf{k}$ since the vertical is separate from the inclined stroke, and in the $\mathbf{k}$ in the next line they are joined carefully; $e$ is $I$ think certain, not v. $\quad 3$ is generally restored dilk k uluis, cf. S. Oscan zicelei. 5 Before $e$ on the edge of the fragment either $s$ or half of $f$ is clearly visible; there may have been a punct after it. The fragment was once fixed to the wall of the Museum, but has now been taken down, and on the back either sum or fum is clear, though only the lower stroke of the $\$$ is left: Garrucci, Bull. Arch. Nap. n. s. I. p. 45 , read suni, but I
think the second transverse stroke of the may still be detected on the edge of the bronze. Cf. the note to the following insc.

Zvet. Osc. 5, Fabr. 2843, 2.

Found in 1850 near the church of S. M. della Penna, on the side near Vasto, now in the Museo Comunale there, where I saw it in April 1894; facsim. Zvet. i. 3, from an impression by Dressel.

## kaal hůsidiis gaav. | viîbis ůhtavis ůf. | kenzsur patt...

Roughly and not quite regularly cut on a broken tablet of bronze, of which only a part on the left hand is lost since there is a clear margin on the other three sides; it is $\cdot 17 \mathrm{~m}$. long by $\cdot 108$ high ( 7 in . by $4 \frac{1}{4}$ ), and has two round holes near the two right-hand corners, for nailing to a wall. The letters are 015 m . ( $\frac{5}{8} \mathrm{in}$.) high, of a rude and in part archaic type; the lower stroke of $\mathbf{s}$ tends to be horizontal, the loops of $f$ and $d$ are open, that of $d$ is angular $(\nabla)$, and $\dot{u}$ still shows its half Greek form $\dot{\gamma}$ three times, as in the coins of Hyria 142 sup., but once it is $\mathcal{V}$ (in $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{u} h t a v i s) ;$ but on the other hand all the cross strokes are horizontal, $p$ and $a$ are both squared, and a is $\boldsymbol{A}$ (once $\boldsymbol{F}$ ) not $\boldsymbol{N}$. On the whole it is less carefully engraved than the preceding insc., but I can see no serious indication of a difference in style between the two except the form of $\stackrel{\circ}{\mathbf{u}}$.

1. 1 close after $\mathbf{v}$ is the foot of a vertical and a very small thorn inclining upwards to the middle of the line, which if it be anything but accidental, must be part of a. 2 the ligature is perhaps not accidental, as the first vertical begins and ends rather higher up than the second $(H)$; over the $\mathbf{i}$ after $\mathbf{b}$ is a dot which must, I think, be accidental. 3 the $t$ is much worn and might be $\bar{z}$ as its lower half is lost, and there is the same choice for the following letter, of which only the upper right-hand tip remains.

What community was responsible for these two public documents (for 189, as it is on bronze, probably, and 190 clearly belongs to that class)? Possibly Histonium (modern Vasto), which was a full municipium down to a late date, see C. I. L. IX. 2835 ff., but more probably the 'censors' were officers of the whole Frentane community, as the censor of Bouianum Vetus was of the Samnites (or Caracene Samnites). The oldest of the numerous Lat. inscc. of Histonium itself seem to be of the Augustan period.

Zvet. Osc. 4, Fabr. 2843.

191 Found at Punta di Penna near Vasto, first published in 1841, now in the Naples Museum, where I saw it in March 1894; photograph from de Petra, apud Zvet. Osc. i. 2.

## iůveis | lůvfreis

On the bottom of a small but very fine head and neck of bronze 047 m . high, 042 broad, with beard and hair in curls or folds, with a small loop above for hanging; the $a \beta$ is late Osc. except that the thorn of $i$ slants. Was it an amulet, a seal, or as Mommsen suggests, a weight? For Jupiter Liber cf. C. I. L. x. 3786 (from Capua, 15 A.D.) and Ix. 3513, a long dedication of a temple to him at Furfo (in Vestinis) in 58 b.c.; there was also a Temple of Jupiter Libertas on the Aventine, called $\Delta i o ̀ s ~ \epsilon \lambda \in v \theta \in \rho i o u$ in the Monum. Ancyranum.
U. D. p. 170, Zvet. Osc. 3, Fabr. 2844.

192 Found in Fresa, 6 miles from Montenero near Vasto, seen by Mommsen in the possession of Sign. Caraba, and first published by him in 1846, Bull. Arch. Nap. (old series) iv. 116 tab. v., and U.D. viii. 3, p. 170.

## .e.renem.

Scratched from right to left on the edge of a large roughly made vessel of clay, the Osc. letters being all reversed except $\mathbf{n}$ and $\mathbf{m}$; before the first $e$ is either $\mathbf{h}$ or $\mathbf{p}$ or $\mathbf{n}$, after $\mathbf{e}$ apparently a slanting $\mathbf{i}$ (not reversed) with the thorn reaching to the bottom of the line: ad fin. Deecke reads $u$, but the strokes in the facsimile are more like r. Petrenem is possible, most editors read heǐrenem.
U. D. p. 170, Zvet. Osc. 6, Fabr. 2845.

Provenance unknown; first published from the Museum of de Giorgio in Lanciano (Anxanum), which collected from a fairly wide area. It is now in the Museum at Naples; facsim. Zvet. Osc. i. 1; the text, which is perfectly clear, is from two good impressions sent me by Sogliano.

## vereias lůvkanateis | aapas kaias palanud

On a bronze token or label $5 \frac{1}{2} \mathrm{in}$. long, $1 \frac{1}{2}$ broad ( 140 m . by ${ }^{\circ} 036$ ), of unusual shape, which may be best shown by the outline on the next page; the circle on the right is a hole, that at the left-hand end apparently a mark made to match; I do not see how it can be a letter.
©.

The letters average 006 m . (from $\frac{3}{16}$ to $\frac{8}{16} \mathrm{in}$.) high in regular Osc. a $a$, with double interp. (single at the end of 1. 1, absent at end of 2); the

letters are rectangular save that the thorn of $i$ slants, the loop of $d$ is angular and open, and all the letters slope slightly backwards, but there seems to be no other special indication of date; the supposed dot of the last $\mathbf{u}$ (Zvet. 으) is so faint that I think it must be accidental ; if it were genuine, it would be the 'school-master's spelling,' for which see p. $144 \mathrm{n} .2 . d$ is worn but certain.

Mommsen (U. D. p. 169) pointed out that the Tabula Peuting. mentions a Pallanum seven miles from Anxanum on the way to Histonium (Vasto), and showed that the district between these two places, including the modern S. Stefano and Atissa, was called 'Lucania' in two independent authorities ${ }^{1}$ of the 11 th century A.D., indirectly confirmed by a third. Hence he inferred that livkanateis related to some community of Lucani, and possibly a town *Luca or *Lucanum: the same name appears also in Volscian territory, v. inf. 256 (Volscian Place Names) $B$.

The tablet must have been attached to some property of the vereii or collegium; if aapas were to be compared with Lat. aqua (the aa- is a serious difficulty), we might [W. R.] suppose it to have been a well, or drinking-fountain, which the guild maintained; cf. the guild of pontifices ('road-makers'), кєлєvӨoтоьoì тaîठєs ('H申аíatou).

Anxanum was a municipium (C. I. L. IX. p. 278), whose oldest Lat. insc. yet known is of Ciceronian date (ib. 2996).
U. D. p. 169, Zvet. Osc. 2, Fabr. 2846.

1 The following are M.'s references: (1) a legend given by the Bollandists on the 1st of June (June, Vol. 1 'inter praetermissos p. 4,' where the town is called Pallonia) ; (2) the same legend contained in it pervetustus codex Langobardicus, in the archives of the church of S. Lucio in Atissa, seen by Mommsen; (3) a warrant of Henry IV. (1084 B. O.), quoted by Muratori, Rerum Ital. Scr. Ir. 2, pp. 607, 670, 671.

194 Along a small bronze plate or ticket, with a hole at the right-hand end, $\cdot 102 \mathrm{~m}$. long, $\cdot 011$ broad, the letters $\cdot 008 \mathrm{~m}$. high ; it is now in the Louvre, and was first published by Lanzi Saggio di ling. Etrusc., (Florence 1824) $\mathrm{HI}^{2}$ vol. 3, p. 525 , from a facsimile sent him by Giovenazzi, a native of the province of the Abruzzi (roughly = Frentani, Marrucini, Paeligni, Marsi, Vestini), and said to come from 'Castell' \& mare della Buca' which has not been identified; if it is the modern Castellamare close to Pescara it is in Vestine country, 30 miles north. Normai Osc. $\alpha \beta$ (with interpunct), except $\square$ for $\bar{N}$, and $\triangleleft$ not $\square$.

## pakis tintiriis

U. D. p. 190, Zvet. Osc. 8 (photogr. i. 7), Fabr. 2904.

## 195-6 FRENTANE COINS.

195 Larinum (see p. 206 f.).

## a. larinei

Type : head of Minerva helmeted )( horse ; above, a star.

## b. larinom?

Lat. a $\beta$ left to right; (a) may be pure Latin, but $D$ is used for $r$, which appears also in the certainly non-Oscan insc. ${ }^{1}$ LADINOD larinor-$(-u m)$ from the same place, with different types, see Beschr. Berl. l.c. The only authority for (b) is Eckhel, Doctrina I. p. 107, who saw the coin at Rome, but does not state its type. About 268 в.c. we have the Gr. insc. $\lambda a \rho \iota \nu \omega \nu$ with the Campanian bull; larinor- is circa 217 B.c. (Head p. 25); ( $\alpha$ ) and (b) are probably of intermediate date ( 250 в.c. Momm.).

None of the coins have any relation to the as-system, though all are of bronze.
C. I. L. I. 24, U. D. p. 203, Friedl. O. M. p. 42, Beschr. Berl. p. 67, Zvet. Osc. 165.
${ }^{1}$ Momm., C.I.L. $\mathbf{I}^{1} .24$, Ix. p. 69, who calls it Oscan, reads it Larinod giving the sign $D$ two different meanings in the same word. This surely is out of the question.

## 'Frentrum.'

## a. frentrei

## b. freternum?

Bronze; Osc. $\alpha \beta$ retrograde, $\exists$ and $T$ are almost exactly rectangular, but $i$ is 1 : date of ( $\alpha$ ), which is fairly frequent, probably about 268 в.c. (Head p. 25). Types: (a) Head of Hermes )(Pegasos, (b) head of Juno with necklace and diadem ) (Bellerophon on Pegasus, fighting Chimaera. Beloch (Ital. Bd, p. 166) supposes that this coin was issued in the name of the whole Frentane community, no doubt rightly; but it is difficult to see how the form ( $a$ ) can be explained except as a locative, implying a town 'Frentrum,' see below. The reading of (b) is doubtful, since the only authority Avellino, Bull. Arch. Nap. 1846 part Iv. p. 25, is not confident of its correctness, and in particular states that the $\mathbf{t}$ is like $\mathbf{S}$, which, as well as the types of the coin, suggests fensernu no. 143 supr.
U. D. p. 201, Head l.c., Poole p. 69, Friedl. O. M. pp. 42 and 64, Beschr. Berl. p. 67, Zvet. Osc. 164.

## 197 Place-Names ${ }^{1}$ of the Frentani ${ }^{2}$.

## A. Well attested (in form, date and locality).

Frentani cl. Frentranus cogn. in C. I. L. vi. 200, col. v. l. 56, Liv. 9. 45 calls them (codd. Feretrani acc. to Momm. U. D. p. 309, -tani acc. to Weissenborn ad loc., Krit. Anhang, edition of 1877) populus and 9.16

 them as inhabiting a town (Cluverius Ital. Ant. p. 1205). That this was called Frentrum appears (pace Beloch Ital. Bund p. 166) from the coin 196 sup. Bopeoveivoc Scylax § 15 is generally taken as a Grecised form of Frentani. The ordinary Latin name has lost the second $r$ by dissimilation, cf. praestigiae: prae-stringo, etc.
Iuuanum, -nenses inscc. (Pl. 3. 12. 106 codd. Lanuenses).
Lārīnum, -nates cl. inscc. cf. no. 195 supr. For its nationality see p. 207 and Momm. C. I. L. IX. p. 69; geographically it belongs to Daunia. Larino.
${ }^{1}$ For the Arrangement and Notation, see the List of Signs and Abbreviations.

- For the Itinerary-tables in the Frentani, see C. I. L. Ix. pp. 203-4,

Tifernus f. v. sub 187 (Samnium) A.
Buca (Boû-), -cani cl. insc.
Histonium, onienses cl. inscc. Văsto.
Anxanum Ptol., It. Ant., inscc. (once -xianum); -ani (cognomine Frentani) Plin. 3. 12. 106, -ates C. I. L. ix. 3314: cf. Momm. ibid. p. 278. Lanciano.

Ortona Itinn. Hort- Plin. 3. 12. 106 " $\rho_{\rho \tau \omega \nu}$ Stra. Ptol. cf. Momm. C. I. L. Ix. p. 281. Ortona a mare.

## B. Less certain.

Zárpos fl. Stra. 5. 4. 2, Ptol. 3. 1. 16 (इup-). Sangro f.
Trinium fl. Plin. 3. 12. 106. Trigno f.
Vellanus fundus (juxta Histonium) C. I. L. IX. 2827.
Herianicus fundus (Histoniensium) ib.
Serranus lacus (juxta Histonium) ib.
Pallanum Tab. P., ? cf. no. 193 supr. ? Paglieta.

## C. Doubtful.

Uscosium It. Ant. p. 314.

[Pagus Urbanus? C. I. L. ix. 2984.]
Care(n)tini Supernates et Infernates Plin. 3. 12. 106.
D. Further modern names.

Termoli, Palmoli, Fresa Grandinaria, Sinello f., Castel di Lama, Atessa, Osento f., Orsogna.

## 198. Personal Names of the Frentani.

A. Frequent.

1. Nomina.
gens Baebia Flauia Hosidia sup. Paquia inf.
2. None of the frequent Cognomina call for notice.

## B. Less frequent.

1. Nomina.

| gens Asubria |
| :---: |
| Auidia |
| Austia (one insc Ausst-) |
| Caesia |
| Calauia inf. |
| Celeria |
| Coelia |
| Colia (one insc.) |
| Crittia |
| Didia |
| Dirutia |
| Fabia |
| Figellia |
| Gabbia |
| Irria (one insc.) |
| Itia (one insc.) |

Iulia
Licinia
Magria
Mettia
Meuia
Monnia (one inse.)
Naeuia
Ninnia l. inf.
Nipia
Numisia inf.
Obidia
Opia?
Otacidia (one insc.)
Pedia
Preccia (one insc.)
Sabbia

Septumia
Staia inf.
Statia inf.
Suetria
Tatia
Tillia
Titia
Trellia (one insc.)
Vaccia
Valeria
Varia, $l$.
Veratia
Vettia
Vibia (equally often
Vibb-) inf.
2. Among the Cognomina may be mentioned

## Ianuarius <br> Proculus

Rufus
Sassus

Saturninus
C. Once only.

1. Nomina.
gens Acria
Aebutia
Aelia
Ahia
Amninia
Anicia
Annidia
Arria
Artenna
Atria
Attia
Aurelia
Autonia
Babia
Barbia $l$.
Billiena
Brinnia
Bruttia
Calpeta[na]
Cerrinia
Claudia
Cluentia $l$.
Coponia
Corisia
Decia inf.
Dessia

| Drussia | Plotia |
| :--- | :--- |
| Epidia inf. | Pompeia |
| Faesasia | Pomponia |
| Fuluia | Pontia |
| Graecinia] l. | Poppaedia |
| Heluidia | Pullia |
| Heria | Raia |
| Horatia | Reccia |
| Iunia | Rimmia |
| Lindia | Rustia |
| Lucceia | Sabidia cf. inf. |
| Luccia | Sacria |
| Lucilia | Sallia |
| Maia inf. | Saluia |
| Messia | Sanonia |
| Modia | Scantia $l$. |
| Moecia | Seia |
| Neria | Sinnia |
| Norbana | Stallia |
| Nummia | Tadia |
| Oppianica | Tantilia |
| Ortoria | Turcia |
| Ouinia | Variena $l$. |
| Paccia | Vesia |
| Papia $l$. | Vesuliia |
| Petronia $l$. | Vtia |
|  |  |

2. Among the Cognomina.

Aprio
Babidus
Bassus

Cerialis
Lepora
Niobe

Polla
Vibius praen.

199-204 COINS OF THE SOCIAL WAR, $90-88$ or 86 B.c.

See generally Friedländer, Osk. Münzen, p. 68 ff., Mommsen-Blacas, Monn. Rom. II. p. 420 ff., Dressel, Beschr. d. ant. Münzen d. kön. Mus. Berlin iII. i. p 57 ff., where the types are given very fully: the commonest is a woman's head (viteliư, Italia). All but the last are of silver. The legends alone are given U. D. p. 201, Zvet. Osc. 186 ff.

## 199

## a. viteliu

b. vitelliů

Some of these coins have $X$, the mark of the Roman denarius, and different specimens show the Oscan letters abgdezhimnp, and $\psi$ and $\Psi$; these cannot be marks of value, but probably served some purpose in the mint. (b) is on a coin in the Blacas collection, Mommsen-Blacas p. 531.

## 200

 g mutil)(safinimSome of these also have a , or b .

201 a. g paapii g mutil)( viteliu
b. g paapii g)(viteliu
c. ITALIA )(g paapig
(b) has on the obv. the denarius sign $\stackrel{*}{*}$. In (c) the fourth letter may be $L$, the rest are clear, see Dressel l.c. p. 62 ; the obv. has *. There is also a coin with a pure Lat. insc., Italia ) (Q. Silo, Momm.-Bl. Monn. Rom. p. 426, and others with Italia alone, in some of which she is seated on three shields and has a lance and sword; Dressel, ibid. p. 63. C. Papius Mutilus and Q. Pompaedius Silo were 'consuls' of the allies in the war (Diod. Sic. 37. 2).

202 a. mutil embratur)(g paapi $g$
b. mutil embratur)(g paapi
c. mutil)(g paapig.

## 203

## ni $1 \mathrm{u} \nabla \mathrm{ki} \mathrm{mr})($ viteliu

For the reading of the second name see Monn. Rom. II. p. 425 n. 2; the ki has been read ii and l ; in the example of the Berlin Museum (Dressel Beschr. Berl. taf. i. 16) k seems fairly clear, but the following letter is obscure. Friedländer (ap. Dressel ib. p. 59) adds that in no example is there a clear l. Neither a 'Luvius,' a 'Lucius,' nor a 'Lucilius' is mentioned in the scanty historical authorities for the Social War. Garrucci (Mon. It. Ant. p. 103) conjectures that he and the Ieius of the next insc. were 'consuls' of the allies in 89 в.c.

## mi ielis mi

A gold coin in the Cabinet de France, beautifully preserved. Type : Head of Bacchante crowned with ivy )(Cista mystica, on which leans a thyrsus; over it a fawn's skin. The weight of this unique coin (8.47 grammes $=$ Attic gold stater, and aureus of Mithridates VI. of Pontus (Head p. 429) also called Eupator and Dionysus, b.c. 121-63) and the types strongly support Garrucci's view (op. cit. p. 106) that it was coined in imitation of money sent by Mithridates to the allies, possibly from raw gold sent at the same time. With the name Mommsen compared the gens Jegia which occurs in Sabine and Aequian inscc. v. 276 A, 311 c (e.g. C. I. L. Ix. 4182), but-g-suffers no change in normal Oscan, and the forms could only be identified by supposing this commander to have come from an Umbrian or Volscian district, where -g-might become - $\mathbf{i}$ - before palatal vowels, and even so the ending -ilis is quite unparalleled. It is possible, I think, that the $\vdash$ may be a mistake of the engraver's for $>$ though of the reading as it stands there is no doubt whatever ${ }^{1}$.

Note Xxi. Many coins have no insc. but simply Oscan numerals.
a. $11 \mathrm{~V}{ }^{\prime} 7$ ' $\|^{\prime} \mathrm{VV}^{\prime} 8$ ' $\mathrm{XI}{ }^{\prime} 9$ '
 $11 \wedge x$ $111 \wedge x$ $\operatorname{lll\wedge x}$

[^51]
## 205. OSCAN GLOSSES ${ }^{1}$ NOT ASSIGNED TO ANY PARTICULAR TRIBE.

A. Glosses whose form and dialect are well attested.

## camur i.e. *camoro- 'bent inwards.'

Ma.cr. 6. 4. 23, Nee non et Punicis Oscisque uerbis usi sunt ueteres, quorum imitatione Vergilius peregrina uerba non respuit, ut in illo 'siluestres uri assidue,' uri enim Gallica uox est...'Camuris hirtae sub cornibus aures' [G. 3. 55] Camuris peregrinum uerbum est, id est in se redeuntibus, et forte nos camaram hac ratione figurauimus.

Macr. therefore does not state that the word is Oscan, but the colour of the anaptyctic vowel which it seems to show (pure Latin would probably have been *camero- of. Camerinum etc.) is perhaps enough additional evidence to warrant us in placing it here.

## * casno- 'old.' casnar 'senex.'

Paul. ex Fest. 47 M. Casnar senex Oscorum lingua, so Non. 86 Merc., Plac. (casnari 'seni') 24, 29 Deuerl. Varro L. L. vii. 29. Idem [i.e. cascum= vetus] ostendit quod oppidum uocatur Casinum; hoc enim a Sabinis orti Samnites tenuerunt et nostri [= Varronis tribules=Sabini] etiam nunc Forum uetus appellant. Item significat in Atellanis aliquot Pappum senem quod Osci Casnar appellant. But Quintil. (1.5. 8 in oratione Labieni...in Pollionem, casnar assectator e Gallia ductum est) is either quoting a word of entirely different origin (with which casnard 'flatterer' casnarder 'flatter' has been compared, see Diez Etym. Wört. Roman. Spr. ${ }^{4}$ p. 540 s.v.); or, less probably, he or Labienus had interpreted the word in the light of the character of Pappus, if he was an assectator.

## daliuo- 'insanus.'

Paul. ex F. 68 M., daliuum supinum ait esse Aurelius, Aelius stultum, Oscorum quoque lingua significat insanum. Santra uero dici putat ipsum quem Graeci $\delta \in i \lambda \alpha \iota \nu$, id est, propter cuius fatuitatem quis misereri debeat. Hesych. $\delta a \lambda i i^{\circ}$. $\mu \omega \rho o ́ s$.
famel 'seruos.'
Paul. ex F. 87 M. Famuli origo ab Oscis dependet apud quos seruus famel nominabatur, unde et familia uocata.
loucětio- 'Jupiter' ; -tia- 'Juno.'
Verg. Aen. 9. 570 Lūcéturum, the name of one of the followers of Turnus, on which Serv. ad loc. Solum hoc nomen dictum a Verg. in nullo alio reperitur auctore. Sane lingua Osea Lucetius est Jupiter dictus a luce... Ipse est

[^52]nostra lingua Diespiter, id est diei pater. So Paul. ex F. 114 M., Gell. 5. 10 quoting Naev., Macrob. Sat. 1. 15. 14 quoting the Saliar hymn (Lucet-), in which Terent. Scaurus (2261 P., Keil, Gramm. Lat. vir. 28) gives the longsuffering form leucesie (Jordan, Krit. Beitr. 31, 219 f.); Marius Victorinus (Keil ib. vi. p. 12, 1. 18) vouches expressly for Loucet. Lucetia Mart. Cap. 2. 149.

## maesio- 'lingua Osca mensis Maius.'

Paul. ex F. 136 M.

## mamers, gen. -ertis 'Mars,' hence the names Mamerco-, Māmertini (cl. e.g. Mart. 13. 117).

Paul. ex F. 130 M. Mamercus praenomen Oscum est ab eo quod hi Martem Mamertem appellant; id. ib. 130 Mamers...unde et Mamertini in Sicilia dicti qui Messanae habitant. Fest. 158 M . gives the legend of the uer sacrum vowed to Apollo. Plut. Num. 21 and Varro L. L. 5. 73, call the name Sabine, as no doubt it also was.
meddix (tuticus) 'the supreme magistrate' (sometimes belonging to a confederacy (e.g. 163 sup.), sometimes to a town ( 99 sup.), and then in some places (e.g. 1 sup.) one of a pair).
Paul. ex F. 123. Meddix apud Oscos nomen magistratus est. Ennius: Summus ibi capitur meddix occiditur alter. Meddixtuticus as one word, Liv., e.g. 23. 35, Is summus magistratus erat Campanis.

## petora 'quattuor.'

Fest. 206 M. Petoritum et Gallicum uehiculum esse et nomen eius dictum esse existimant a numero IIII rotarum. Alii Osce quod hi quoque petora quattuor uocent, alii Graece sed aio入ıкิ̂s dictum. So Paul. ad loc.
pipatio 'clamor plorantis lingua Oscorum.'
Paul. ex F. 212 M.
pitpit 'Osce quicquid,' id. ib.

## sollo- 'totus.'

Fest. 293 M. (s.v. solitaurilia) Sollum Osce totum et soldum significat, unde tela quaedam soliit ferrea (sollif. Müll.) uocantur tota ferrea, et homo bonarum artium sollers, et quae nulla parte laxata cauaque sunt, solla [cod. solida] nominantur. Similarly id. 298 M. s.v. sollo, quoting the corrupt verse of Lucil., 'Suasa quoque omnino dirimit non sollo dupundi, id est non tota.' Cf. perhaps also the glosses sollistimum, sollox. [In any case the stem sollo-must have been in early use in Latin, as sollennis, sollicitus etc. show. J. P. P.]
supparo- (? -oro- or -ara-)'an outer garment.'
Varro L. L. 5. 131, Indutui alterum quod subtus a quo subucula; alterum quod supra, a quo supparus, nisi id quod item dicunt Osce. Paul. ex Fest. 311, Supparus uestimentum puellare lineum, quod et subucula, id est camisia uocatur. The doubling of the $p$ before $r$ (von Planta Osk.- Umb. Gr. p. 542), and the anaptyctic vowel both indicate a genuine Oscan word, but the -a-is only intelligible if the final syllable contained $-a$ - i.e. if the word was an $-a$ - stem.

## ueia- 'plaustrum.'

Paul. ex F. 368 M. Veia apud Oscos dicebatur plaustrum ; inde ueiari stipites in plaustro et uectura veiatura.

## ungulo- 'anulus.'

Fest. 375 M . Ungulus 0 scorum lingua anulus ut十... Si quid monumenti nacta est quor (Müll., MS qui eorum) requireret, est ungulus quem ei detraxit ebrio. Pacuuius in Iliona: Repugnanti ego porro hunc ui detraxi ungulum, et in Atalanta: Suspensum in laeuo brachio ostendo ungulum. So Paul. ad loc.

B and C. Glosses showing Oscan phonetic characteristics though not assigned to Oscan, whose form is (B) well attested, or (C) less certain.
B. 1. With medial f (Oscan, Volscian, or Praenestine ?).
bufus 'bubo,' Löwe, Prodrom. p. 421, cf. Rem. 2 inf.
nefrundines 'rienes.'
Fest. 277 M. Rienes quos nunc uocamus antiqui nefrundines appellabant quia Graeci veфpoús eos uocant. Cf. Paul. ex F. 168 M. Sunt qui nefrendes testiculos dici putent, quos Lanauini appellant nebrundines, Graeci veфpoús, Praenestini nefrones.
sipilare 'sibilare.'
Non. 531 Merc. Sifilare quod nos, uilitatem uerbi euitantes, sibilare dicimus; et est maledica nocis significatio uel contumeliosa popularium, cum sifilationibus quis exploditur. [Also in Appendix Probi 199 K. W. M. L.]

## tifata 'iliceta.'

Paul. ex F. 366 M. Tifata iliceta, Romae autem Tifata curia. Tifata enim locus iuxta Capuam. Bücheler Rhein. Mus. 39, p. 421 plausibly connects with the Sab. teba 'collis' ( 309 inf .). If so the $\bar{i}$ may also be a mark of Oscan, but, since the word was in use at Rome, it seems more probable that the $\bar{e}$ in teba is the Sabine equivalent of $e i$.
? trifax 'telum trium cubitorum.'
Paul. ex F. 367 M . Trifax telum longitudinis trium cubitorum, quod catapulta mittitur. Ennius: Aut permaceret ${ }^{1}$ paries percussu' trifaci. The $\bar{a}$ makes it more reasonable to analyse the word trif- $\bar{a} c$ - than to connect it with $f a \check{c}-i o$, contrast for-fex, ficcis etc.
C. 1. The following forms are parallel but less certain: crefrat 'cribrat,' Löwe, Prodrom. p. 421.

## effafilare (? -fapill- -fabill-) 'exserere.'

Paul. ex F. 85 M. Effafilatum, exertum, quod scilicet omnes exerto brachio sint exfilati, id est, extra vestimentum filo contextum. So Placid. 20 Deuerl. Effafilatus, exerto umero ; but id. p. 41 (Cod. Parisin.) Exfabillauero, exeruero. But Non. 102 Merc. Expapillato brachio, quasi usque ad papillam renudato. Plautus (B, C, and D) Mil. Glor. 1180: id conexum in umero laeuo, ecfafillato brachio, generally altered to -pap- to suit Nonius.
? farferus 'uirgulti genus,' Plaut. Poen. 2. 1. 32, Paul. ex F. 88 M.; -farus Plin. 24. 15. 135. But if it is a compound as farfugium (Plin. ibid.) seems to be, it may be pure Latin.

## mufrius ' $\mu v$ Өódoyos.'

Petron. Sat. 58 Qui te haec docet, mufrius non magister. Büch. Rh. Mus. 39. 415 connects the word with $\mu \hat{v} \theta o$ s.

1 'For this corrupt word I should propose perluceret, of. Juv. 11. 13, Sen, H. F. 1001.' J. P. P.
mulcifer 'Mulciber, Volcanus,' Löwe, Prodr. p. 421.
? nanfurae 'quod medici naphtham uocant,' Placid. 68 Deuerl.

Remare 1. The form $a f=a b$ (Cic. Orator $47 \S 158$ and on insce. before consonants only, e.g. C. I. L. II. 551) would seem to be pure Latin from Cicero's account, and, if so, probably was the genuine phonetic form of the preposition before certain consonants ( $c, q, v, f$ ? ) which ultimately was levelled out of use.

## Remark 2. Latin words like

bufo, rufus, scrofa, tufus, vafer
were undoubtedly derived from one of the $f$-dialects, and so are Mod. Ital. bifolco, bufalo, tafano, scarafaggio. W. Meyer ap. Gröber, Grundr. Roman. Philol. § 74, and Ascoli, Archivio Glottologico Italiano x. 1.
B. 2. With s between vowels (Oscan, Paelignian, or Sabine?).

## immusulus 'auis genus.'

Paul. ex F. 112 M. Immusulus auis genus quam alii regulum, alii ossifragum dicunt. Plin. x. 7. 20 gives other interpretations.
C. 2. The following forms are less certain:
adasia 'ouis uetula recentis partus,' Paul. ex F. 12 M.
amosio 'annuo,' id. 26 M .
? asisua ? 'petauro pernice,' Plac. 40 Deuerl.
carisa ? 'uetus lena.'
Plac. 27 Deverl. Carisa uetus lena percallida, unde et in mimo fallaces ancillae 'cata carisia' appellantur.
frontesia 'ostenta,' Plac. 45. 4 Deuerl. (so MSS, no doubt rightly: Büch. Rh. Mus. 39, p. 409 compares *ßроутíбıa (Bpovтクбıкє́pavvos Ar. Nub. 265), and for the $f$ the relation of $\beta \rho \epsilon \epsilon^{\mu} \omega$ : fremo ?).

 39, p. 419.
? Vernisera 'mensalia auguria' Paul. ex F. 379 M. may be a compound.

Remark 3. The following words which appear in classical Latin authors I am now inclined to regard as being possibly or probably of dialectic origin:

| agaso | caseus | rosa (S. Osc., no |
| :--- | :--- | :---: |
| asilus | equiso | doubt ${ }^{*}$ rodia) |
| caesius | omasum | siser? |
| casa | pusus |  |

with the termination -sio-, e.g. in indusium, amasius, and very numerous proper names; also other proper names, notably Caesar, whose ending, as Keller points out, is probably Oscan. Other words (e.g. lases) may be simply from Old Latin documents, others borrowed from elsewhere (e.g. petasunculus is Gallic); others are still obscure, see the list Verner's Law in Italy, p. 74, to which add cisium (ciss. Non. 87 Merc.).

Remark 4. For forms containing labials for velars (bos, popina etc.) see min inf. Rem. 1.
B. 3. With $-\mathrm{ss}-=-\mathrm{x}-(0 \mathrm{scan})$.
cossim 'a coxa,' Non. 40 Merc.
B. 4. ? With -tt- (see Bartholomae Bezz. Beitr. xii. 80, von Planta Osk.-Umb. Gr. §§ 205, 228 and also § 243, Conway Verner's Law in Italy p. 39, Class. Rev. 1893 p. 464).
atta (1) 'lame, walking with difficulty'; (2) 'pater, auos.'
(1) Paul. ex F. 12 M. Attae appellantur qui propter uitium crurum aut pedum plantis insistunt et adtingunt magis terram, quam ambulant, quod cognomen Quintio poetae adhaesit. (2) id. ib. Attam pro reuerentia seni cuilibet dicimus, quasi eum aui nomine appellemus. So minor Glossogr. ap. Löwe Prodromus, p. 389.
butubatta Naeuius pro nugatoriis Paul. ex F. 36 M.
hetta 'a worthless trifle (bubble or pomegranate-capsule ?).'
Paul. ex F. 99 M. Hetta res minimi pretii quasi hieta id est hiatus hominis atque oscitatio: alii pusulam dixerunt esse quae in coquendo pane solet assurgere, a qua accipi rem nullius pretii, cum dicimus: Non hettae te facio. With this Müll. compares Gloss. Labb. (Corp. Gloss. Lat. II. pp. 462, 472, 493)

st/atta ? 'genus nauigii.'
Paul. ex F. 312 M. Stlatta genus nauigii latum magis quam altum, sed ea consuetudine qua stlocum pro locum et stlitem pro litem dicebant. The name is mentioned by Gell. 10.25.5, and occurs also in Auson. Ep. 22. 31 and in the derivative stlattarius Juv. 7. 134 and Enn. ap. Schol. ad loc. But MSS often give the spelling stlata-

## strittabilla 'limping,' strittare, strittilare,

Varro L. L. 7. 64. Strittabillas a strettillando (lege stritt-?); strittare ab eo qui sistit aegre. Non. 169 Mere. Strettivellas exprobratio uitii aut deformitatis meretricum. Plautus Neruolaria: scrattae, scrupipedae, strettiuellae, sordidae. (For scrattae see C. 4.)

## C. 4. The following form is less certain:

scratta, scrattia or scrapta ? 'despicienda mulier.'
Fest. 333 M. Scraptae dicebantur nugatoriae ac despiciendae mulieres, ut ait Verrius [deriving it from screa]...Titinius in Prilla: Rectius mecastor Piculetae Postumae Lectum hodie stratum uidi scrattiae mulieris. Non. 169

Mere. Scraptas...exprobratio uitii aut deformitatis meretricum. Plantus Neruularia: Scrattae scrupipedae strettivellae sordidae. Gell. 3. 3. 6 quoting the same line with the same comment gives scrattae, and so minor Glossogr. Löwe p. 281. Varro L. L. 5. 65 Spengel gives scratiae.

Remark 5., With these must be classed 'Latin' forms like blatta, Cotta, littera, mitto, at least until their -tt- is satisfactorily explained otherwise. But words in which -tt- follows an originally long -ū- gūtus, glūtus (and perhaps futtilis) may in any case be pure Latin, of. succus for sucus, cuppa for cūpa etc., if the suggestion in Verner's Law in It. p. 41 footn. be correct. So Vulg. Lat. muttus (Fr. mot), if it comes from $\mu \hat{\theta} \theta$ os (so Lindsay, Lat. Lang. p. 58).
B. 5. With -ū- for -ō- (Oscan or Volscian?).
cupa beside Gr. кө́tr, Cato $R . R$. e.g. 21. 1; the word may be either a genuine Italic equivalent, or borrowed.

Remark 6. flutae $=\pi \lambda \omega \tau$ al a kind of muraena, Varro e.g. R. R. 2. 6. 2, Col. 8. 17. 8, may conceivably have been altered from *plutae to suit fluo.

Note xxil. What is to be said of $i$ for $e$ in Mircurius and commircium ('antiquis relinquamus' Varro Fragm. p. 175 Willmanns), cf. Praen. Mirqurios 292 inf., which appears also in Osc. amiricatud? If the $e$ is long by nature, Osc. $\bar{\imath}$ is regular. Compare stircus in Note iv. p. 31 sup. (C. I. L. IX. 782).
B. 6. With $\overline{\mathrm{i}}$ for $\overline{\mathrm{u}}$ (Oscan or Volscian?).
glito-=glutus, Cat. R. R. 45. 2, glittis 'levibus, subactis, teneris,' Paul. ex F. 98 M.
C.

Remark 7. Scripulum, the bye-form of scruppulus, used to denote a weight ( $\frac{1}{24}$ uncia), seems to show just such a restriction of meaning as may be expected in a borrowed word; cf. e.g. Verner's Law in Italy, p. 61.

Remark 8. For forms with e- before vowels in place of normal Latin $i$ (e.g. veha 'via') see 305 A Remark.
B. 7. With nom. masc. in -el=Lat. -ulus.
mascel, figel given in Appendix Probi 197 K. are clearly parallel to famel A sup. [W. M. L.]

Note zxiii. Oscan $-n n$. frequently corresponds to Latin $-n d$-, though the origin of both sounds is still disputed (see Von Planta, Osk.Umb. Gr. § 204, Conway Class. Rev. v. p. 296). It is possible that the forms
grunnire $=$ grundire, Non. 465 Merc., and
perfines, 'perfringas' (?=-findes) Fest. 205 M. may be Oscan. innulgen? 'indulgenti' C. I. L. x. 1211 (Abella 170 A.D.). tennitur (Ter. Phorm. 2. 2. 16), dispennite, distennite (Plaut. Mil. 1407), Leuenna Laberius ap. Gell. 16. 7, sociennus (Plaut. Aul. 4. 4. 32), Tń $\beta \epsilon \nu \nu a$ 'toga' (common in Polyb. Dion. Hal. Strab. etc., sometimes -evvos, -evos, - $\epsilon \nu(\mathrm{s})$, transenna, uerecunnus (C. I. L. Iv. 1768), Julia Oriunna ib. vi 3. 20589 and cannela App. Probi 197 K. must be classed with them. So Stolz, Hist. Lat. Gram. 1894 p. 318. The -nn- is so widespread in Mod. Italian dialects that in these it must almost certainly have descended from Osco-Umbrian; according to Meyer-Lübke it pervades the whole of Southern and Central Italy from Tarentum to the Ombrone in Tuscany and Osimo in Umbria; see his Italien. Gram. p. 132-3. The parallel replacement of $-m b$ - by - $m m$ - is only directly attested for S. Apulia.
C. 8. With variation between tenuis and media (cp. the following Note and 37 sup. A 1 and B 1):

abludam 'paleam,' Plac. 8. 4 Deuerl., but

apluda is the commoner form, and far better attested, e.g. Paul. ex F. 10 Apluda est genus minutissimae paleae frumenti siue panici, de qua Naeuius: Non hercle apluda est hodie quam tu nequior. Similarly Non. 69 Merc., Plin. $15 \| 89$, Gell. 11. 7. 5, Plac. 8. 13. [Abluda may be merely $=$ popular attempt to connect the word with abluo in the sense of 'offscouring.' J. P. P.]
ropio 'Quem non pudet, et rubet, non est homo sed ropio' a jest at Pompey's florid complexion preserved by Mar. Sacerdos ( 426 K .) who adds : ropio est minium aut piscis robeus aut penis. For the last meaning see the modern texts of Catullus 37. 10. Lindsay (p. 76, to whom I owe the quotation) is clearly right in regarding the form as a dialectal pronunciation of a derivative of Lat. robus, Italic roufo-. The form propom in 159 sup. is exactly parallel.
On Lat. sibus, persibus 'acutus, callidus' see the Glossary s. v. sipus.

Note xxiv. On certain words borrowed from Greek and showing an alteration of tenuis to media.
W. Meyer-Liibke remarks (in Gröber's Grundr. Rom. Philol. p. 365 § 32 and Gramm. d. Langues Romanes p. 33) that in vulgar Latin the Greek aspirates were always represented by tenues (purpura, apua, tus), the Greek tenues by mediae ${ }^{1}$ (in the Grammaire des Langues Romanes p. 34 he notices that there are no examples for $d=\tau$, which can hardly be anything but an accident). This appears to me to confirm the explanation given in Am. Journ. Phil. xI. p. 310, which was based on the theory that these words came into Latin through Oscan and that the Oscan mediae were voiceless or whispered. If so, to an Oscan the ordinary Greek tenuis would sound nearer to his own media than to his own vigorously pronounced tenuis, which more closely resembled the Greek aspirate ${ }^{2}$. Hence Gr. $\pi v \rho \rho o-$

[^53]became burro-, while Фoivo- became Poeno-1. But since the words appear in Latin sources we must further suppose either (1) that they were taken from Oscan into Latin before the Latin mediae became voiced and suffered the change in Latin along with the rest, or (2) that they were borrowed directly from Greek into Latin at the same early period, i.e. before 300 в.c. (see Am. Journ. Ph. l.c.), which is geographically and historically far less probable. But (3) some of them (e.g. incitega) may never have come into real Latin use at all but have been simply observed by the gloss-writers in Oscan sources spelt in Oscan fashion. Hence even if the truth of my main contention be granted-and these words appear to me strong evidence for it whichever of the three possible views be adopted-, yet the uncertainty as between these three makes it uncertain at what time the words were in use in Oscan, and even how far they were ever Oscan at all.
burro-=Gr. $\pi v \rho \rho o ́ s$, burra, burranica.
Paul. ex F. 31 M. Burrum dicebant antiqui quod nunc dicimus rufum; unde rustici burram appellant buculam quae rostrum habet rufum. Pari modo rubens cibo ac potione ex prandio burrus appellatur. id. 36 M . Burranicum genus vasis, and Burranica potio appellatur lacte mixtum sapa a rufo colore quem burrum uocant.

Similarly Cic. Orator § 160.

## incitega 'a wine-stand.'

Paul. ex F. 107 M. Incitega machinula in qua constituebatur in conuiuio uini amphora, de qua subinde deferrentur uina. Müller's derivation from '̇ $\gamma \gamma v \theta \dot{\eta} \kappa \eta$ or $\dot{a} \gamma \gamma 0 \theta \dot{\eta} \kappa \eta$ (which Athenaeus 210 a-c describes in almost identical terms) cannot be disputed. The $c$ for $\gamma$ might be explained as due to some analogy with Latin words like incitare, incitus, incidere.

[^54]Other common forms of the same sort are buxus, Buxentum, carbasus, gammarus, gobius, gorytus, gummi(s), grabbatus, gubernare, masturbari ( $\mu a \sigma \tau \rho o \pi-)^{1}$. Saalfeld (Lautges, Gr. Lehnwörter p. 27-31) adds buxis, gamelum, gaunacen (both in Scaurus, Keil viI. 14), and W. Meyer Gröber's Grundr. p. 365 gives also golpos ( $\kappa$ b $\lambda \pi$ ros). Seelmann, Ausspr. p. 347, adds from Probi App. (Keil iv. 1981. 9) galatus =кá入aOos, Progne, Gnidus and Gnossius [where the $g$ arose phonetically before the $n$. J. P. P.], and a few misspellings with $g$ for $c$, and (p. 309) $d$ for $t$, which as being merely occasional, do not deserve to be classed on 5 level with the other examples. Several exx. from late Latin, whose history is more doubtful, may be found in Lindsay p. 75 .

## Remark 9. Words with tenuis in place of Greek media².

The change here is of a far more doubtful character. Logically it is just conceivable, given the Oscan voiceless or whispered pronunciation of the mediae, that these words should have been borrowed into Oscan, pronounced in Oscan fashion, and handed on into Latin at a date when the Latin mediae were all fully voiced (much later than the words under ( $\alpha$ ) above), so that the Oscan mediae by contrast sounded like tenues and were so written. But there is very scanty evidence for such an assumption, and it is mentioned here chiefly in order that the forms in question may be sharply distinguished from those discussed above in Note xxiv.; all the forms seem to fall into one or other of the following classes:
(1) Words on vases, probably half-Etruscan, Alixentrom, Cassantra, etc. (so Lattes, Tscriz. Paleolat. passim).
(2) Words with latinised ending, citrus (if it really be from кé $\delta \rho o s^{3}$ ), spelunca, amurca ${ }^{4}$, cf. atro-, taetro-, vitro-, etc., uncus, urca, etc., latices Gr. $\lambda a ́ t a \gamma \in s$ (Lindsay p. 75).
${ }^{1}$-turb- from - $\tau \rho o \pi$ - probably through Osc. influence. - $-\boldsymbol{\rho} 0 \pi$ - would become first -torob- in Osc., and then in Latin, with the accent on the following - $\bar{a}$-, -torb-, and that -turb- by the influence of turbare. The Greek and Latin words cannot be separated, pace Bücheler. The change 'Нрак入- to Osc. Hercl- to Lat. Hercul- is not very dissimilar.
${ }^{2}$ Keller (Lat. Vlksetym. p. 302) gives $\triangle$ good number ; one or two more are to be found in Saalfeld l.c. p. 23 ff., mostly repeated by Seelmann Ausspr. pp .309 and 343. They have all been considered in what follows.
${ }_{3}$ The alleged change in this word of $-d r$ - to $-t r$ - is explained by Thurneysen (K. Z. 32, p. 562), and Wharton (Eyym. Lat. 125, 131) as phonetic.
${ }^{4}$ Servius ad G.1. 194 says amurca was written with $c$ but pronounced with $g$ (Lindsay, p. 75).

Here I should class Catamitus the Italian form of Tavvuグôns（e．g．Plaut． Men．1．2．35），with the Osc．change of $\bar{e}$ to $\bar{\imath}$ ．The ending may have first become－ido－，as＇Hpak入 $\bar{s}$ became Herklo－（Hereklo－），and then，thanks to its meaning，assimilated to passive partcc．in－to－．［The word probably came into use in some bi－lingual city like Nola，and the first part may have been influenced by кататúyตע．J．P．P．］
（3）Words changed by popular etymology；conger if it＝$=$ órypos has suffered from congero；cotonia mala（кvo̊＇via）＇quinces＇may have been in－ fluenced by cottana＇Syrian figs＇or connected by gardeners with the native word cotonea＇wall－wort，bryony．＇Canöpus from Kávఐßos probably through the ending of Europa，Aethiopes，etc．
（4）Words transcribed from old Lat．documents，with $\mathrm{C}=\mathrm{g}$ ：cracentes， clucidatus Paul．ex F．53， 55 M．
（5）Words of doubtful etymology：taedu＝$\delta a ̂ \partial a ?$（Keller）；Teretinu－ tibus a fumine Terede？Fest． 363 M．；petiolus a pede（？？）Non． 160 Merc．； Venus fruti，frutinal，frutilla，which Müller ad Paul．ex F． 90 compares with ＇Aфpo8ity．The only word left is
（6）triumphus．This form cannot be directly compared with Att．Gr． Opiáßios（itself of doubtful origin），because the evidence in Latin proves that the Greek form had $\phi$ ．

Cic．Or．$\S 160$ states that in triumphus，Cethegus etc．，preceding generations pronounced simply $-p-$－$t$－，but his own $-p h$－，－th－，genuine aspirates；later on Mart．Cap．（§ 311，p．313）expressly vouches for the pronunciation triumfo－in his own day（cf．Itn．trionfo）and the $f$ is written several times on inscc．，e．g． C．I．L．x．1655．Varro（L．L．6．68）and Quint．（1．5．20）give the usual derivation from $\theta$ pia $\mu \beta o s$ ，an epithet of Bacchus（cf．Arr．Anab．6．28）．I should suggest that the form in use in some Greek dialect of lower Italy was＊$\tau \rho \rho \rho \mu \phi$ s（either an original variant of $\theta \rho i a \mu \beta$ os as $\pi i \theta$－os of $\phi \iota \delta$－ák $\eta \eta$ ．etc．or a modification of it to suit a supposed derivation from $\tau \rho \iota$－and $3 \mu \phi \dot{\eta}$ ？）．Compare Lat．nummus borrowed from Syrac．$\nu о \hat{v} \mu \mu \circ$ s contrasted with Att．$\nu \dot{\delta} \mu \circ \mathrm{s}, \nu \delta \mu \mu \sigma \mu$ on the one hand，and the pure Italic＊num（e）so－on the other．Since first writing this． explanation I have found that the form $\delta t \theta \dot{\theta} p a \mu \phi$ os occurs on an Attic vase（now in the Thorwaldsen Museum Copenhagen（ n .97 ）beside the figure of a Satyr） which seems is fairly strong confirmation ${ }^{1}$ ．

[^55]D. Glosses whose form is less certain, and which, though assigned to Oscan, show no specially Oscan characteristics.
asta 'wool-cardings, sordes.'
Varro L. L. 7. 54. Carminari dieitur cum ex lana carunt quod in ea haeret neque est lana, quae in Romula Naeuius appellat asta ab Oscis.

## caria 'bread'; carensis (?) 'baker.'

Placid. p. 25. 19 Deuerling Carensis, pistoribus a caria quam Oscorum lingua panem esse dicunt. Paul. ex F. 58 M . Cammensem $\dagger$ cursorem Titinnius pro pistore dixit which Büch. Osk. Bleit. p. 43, comparing Osc. karanter, would correct to cariensem; Bugge (Altit. Stud. 45) would alter carensis to careasics (or better cereasiis?), quoting Interpolator Serv. Georg. 1. 7 (cf. below, Sabine Glosses Ceres 'panis'), also Gloss. Amplon. ${ }^{2}$ p. 287 b, Cerealis 'pistor,' and Mai Class. Auct. 8. 49 cereasius 'pistor.' The two words (cari-cere-) may be quite distinct.

## $\gamma^{\epsilon} \lambda a^{6} \pi \dot{\alpha} \chi \nu \eta \eta^{\prime}$ ?


 $\gamma \epsilon \in \lambda a \nu \lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$.

## III. NORTHERN OSCAN.

(Paeligni, Marrucini, Vestini with the valley of the Aternus.)
These peoples are first mentioned as members of a confederacy which included the Marsi, with which the Romans came into conflict in the Second Samnite War (325 B.c., Liv. 8. 29). On the submission of the Samnites they all came into alliance with Rome in 305-2 b.c. (Liv. 9. 45, 10. 3, and Diod. 20. 101), the Paelignians having fought hard (Diod. 20.90) against even this degree of subjection. Each of them was an independent unit and in none was there any town or community politically separate from the tribe as a whole. Thus the Vestini issued coins in the 3rd century ( 249 inf .); and each of them appears in the list of the allies in the Social War (App. B. C. 1. 39) ${ }^{1}$. How purely Italic in sentiment these communities of the mountain-country remained appears from the choice of Corfinium as the rebel capital, though the strength of its position from a military point of view was no doubt the chief point in its favour.

The few inscc. we possess are enough to show that the dialect spoken by these tribes was substantially the same, from the Northern boundary of the Frentani (Rapino) to some place in the (probably upper) Aternus valley not a hundred miles from Aquila (Amiternum), see the note to 248 inf.; and that this dialect closely resembled the Oscan of Lucania and Samnium

[^56]though presenting a few peculiarities of its own ${ }^{1}$. I have therefore called it North Oscan.

For the history of the Paelignians after 90 b.c. see the references given in C. I. L. IX. pp. 290 (Sulmo, esp. Ovid, e.g. Fasti 4. 79, Amor. 2. 16, Florus 2. 9, Caes. B. C. 1. 18) and 296 (Corfinium, e.g. Diod. Sic. 37. 2. 4, Caes. B. C. 1. 15). So far as I can judge, none of the Latin inscc. of the district need be older than Sulla, but some of them both in language and script show the style of his period (e.g. 3087, 3137); and on the other hand, as several of the native inscc., which are all in Lat. $a \beta$, show the normal letters of the Ciceronian period, I have little doubt that, for religious and private purposes at least, the Paelignian dialect lasted down to the middle of the first century b.c. The oldest of the following insce. is clearly 211 whose $a \beta$, if it were in Rome, would probably not be later than 180 B.C. and might be a century earlier.

Paelignian and the North Oscan group of inscc. generally form a most important link in the chain of the Italic dialects, as without them the transition from Oscan to Umbrian would be completely lost. This renders all the greater the debt which learning owes to Prof. Antonio de Nino, whose brilliant gifts and unsparing devotion to the antiquities of his native district have rescued for us every single Paelignian monument that we possess. The unique collection of inscc. and antiquities of Pentima and the growing museum at Sulmona have both been created by his almost unaided efforts.

[^57]
## A. Paeligni.

## 1. Inscriptions of Sulmo (Sulmona) 206-215.

## 206

Found towards the end of 1892 in Pettorano, within the bounds of Sulmo, in tomb used for burial (without burning), and now in the Museum at Sulmona where I saw it in April 1894; first published by de Nino in the Rivista Abruzzese (issued at Teramo) for February 1893 and February 1894, with comments by von Planta, Pauli, and Bücheler, and then in Not. Scav. 1894, p. 178.

## saluta musosa pa | anaceta ceria | et aisis sato

On a block of local limestone 80 m . high by 50 broad, the letters .037 m . high in Lat. $a \beta$ ( $A, E, L, M, N, O, F, S, T)$ of the Gracchan type ; under each line is a long horizontal bar; the interpunct is a cross ( $x$ ), and regular, but not used at the end of the line; the text is perfectly clear and certain.

From a linguistic point of view this inse. appears to be of great importance. The form Musesa compared with the gens Mussidia of Lat. inscc. of Sulmo (C. I. L. IX. 3114 and probably 3112) seems to me to place beyond doubt Thurneysen's explanation of the sign $\theta$ in $216 \mathrm{inf} .(q . v$.$) as$ representing a palatal $\check{z}$ (Eng. or French $j$ ) arising from -di- or - $i-$ alone between vowels.

Women occur frequently as priestesses at Sulmo (Cereris et Veneris sacerdos C. I. L. Ix. 3087 ff., Isidis sacerdos ib. 3091, magistra Angitiis ${ }^{1}$ (donum offerens) ib. 3074, and at Corfinium (ministra Matris Magnaeib. 3146, sacerdos Cereris ib. 3170, sacerdos Veneris ib. 3166-7). Compare the next following insec. and 216-7: for conjectures as to the meaning of anaceta see Pauli and Bücheler l.c., also Pauli Altit. Stud. v. p. 36 f., and Büch. Rh. Mus. 37. 664. The indisputably sepulchral character and provenance of this and the other similar stones (both with Pael, and Lat. insce.) appear to me to favour strongly Biicheler's view that anaceta is nom. sing. fem. meaning 'sacerdos,' rather than dat. sing. 'Angitiae,' as Pauli l.c. and von Planta Osk.-Umb. Gram. p. 163 regard it.
${ }^{1}$ Cf. ?Dis Ancitibus [B]usutrauorum, C. I. L. 1x. 3515 (and p. 261 inf.), to whom a vow is paid for 'salus.'

207 Found in la Badia Morronese in a tomb with several vases, a black-glazed amphora and other objects; first published by de Nino in Not. Scav. 1891, p. 295, and now in the Museum at Sulmona, where I saw it in April 1894.

## tettia sa | anac cerr

On a well-preserved slab 1 m . high (the lower third of which was left rough, to be sunk in the ground) by 48 m . broad (the top a fastigium, of which each side measures 25 m .), in well-cut Latin characters of the best period, $T, E, A, N, R$, with finials and three-pointed interp. The letters of the first line are $2 \frac{1}{2} \mathrm{in}$. high, those of the second $1 \frac{3}{4}$. See the note to the preceding insc.

208 Found in a tomb in the fields at Introdacqua, a part of ancient Sulmo, first published by de Nino in Not. Scav. May 1890, and seen by me in the Museum at Sulmona in April 1894.

## anaceta | cerria

On a small rectangular cippus of limestone now $13 \frac{1}{2} \mathrm{in}$. high by $9 \frac{1}{2}$ ( 34 by $\cdot 24 \mathrm{~m}$., or almost exactly 14 by 10 Roman inches), which probably contains only the last two lines of the orig. insc., though these are only separated by $\frac{3}{4} \mathrm{in}$, whereas there is a clear uninjured space of $1 \frac{3}{4} \mathrm{in}$. above the first. Lat. $a \beta, A, C$ and $C=c, E, R$.

See the note to 206.

Found by de Nino in May 1895 in the 'Contrada Cuscenelle' in the territory of Sulmo, and first published by C. Pascal in Not. Scav. 1895 p. 251 . The text is from several impressions sent me by de Nino; differences from Pascal's reading are noted below.
> .hospus..legil.... x at mat m.sicu men...um...usuad | famel inim loufir 5 des....pac..d.a.

On a rectangular block of local limestone, now measuring 31 m . in length by 14 in height, and 24 m . from front to back. It has certainly lost something on the left, but probably not on the right, as 11.2 and 4 end well within the margin. Lat. $a \beta$, of Sullan or Ciceronian period ( $A, G$, $L, \Gamma$ ) with strokes slightly broadened at the end. Circular interpunct,
only certain at the end of 1.2 , and after each word in 1.4, probable after $\mathbf{x}$, at, and mat in 1.2 , possible after $\underline{p}$ in 1.1 , and in 1.2 between $\boldsymbol{\pi}$ and at, and in 1.3 after men ; there is certainly none before suad. 1. 1 of $\underline{h}$ only the lower halves of two hastae are left ; the first $\Phi$ might be $\mathbf{b}$; us fairly clear, then space for two letters, possible fl or il ; at the end -1 seems to me fairly clear, then space for three letters. Pascal gives 1 legie. 2 is fairly clear, possibly mesicu. 3 Pasc. menincium, which seems just possible, so does men eccum ; before usuad I think is the top of either $\mathbf{r}$ or $\mathbf{p} . \quad 4$ is perfectly clear. 5 of $\mathbf{d}$ only the upper curve is left, possibly $\mathbf{r}$; es might be fo (Pasc. of $0[u] \mathbf{c}$ ) ; c might be e, then perhaps $\mathbb{1}$; then a letter's space (a is possible), then $\underline{\mathbb{d}}$ is fairly certain, and after space for a letter or punct a.

Pascal's 'restoration' is unhappily based on the insce. in East Italian $a \beta$ (from Bellante etc., see the Appendix), which must be at least two centuries older than this.

209, 210 Inscriptions preserved in manuscript. of the original letters, 210 almost entirely in cursive) on to a leaf now prefixed to $=$ XVI century collection of insec. in the library of Bologna. The 'hand' of the copyist is unknown, but he adds to an insc. of Luna (C. I. L. xI. 1324), which he gives on the same leaf, the date Nov. 11, 1629. The inscc. were first found there by Mommsen in 1862, but he had found another copy of 209 as early as 1849 (U. D. tab. xv., C. I. L. r. ${ }^{1}$ 194) in a small collection of Latin inscc. attached to the Gudian ms. (cod. 197) in the library of Wolfenbüttel. I owe to the kindness of Prof. $O$. von Heinemann the present librarian several
particulars as to this collection, see below. The originals of both insce. are of course unknown. Zvet. It. Med. v. 6 and 5 gives copies of the Bologna text, but see further Mommsen C. I. L. I. ${ }^{1}$ p. 555 ; Panli's facsimiles Altit. Stud. v. Tab. 1 add but little. The text of the two copies agrees, except as mentioned below.

Lat. $a \beta$ with $E, F$ (not II, I') and $C=g$; interp. regular save after pacia, bratom, pperci and suois in Bol.; so in Wolf., where it is absent also after cia, pam and 11. 1, 2 and 5 ad fin.

1. 1 Wolf. $C \mid A, B o l$. C|A $\wedge$; else the latter gives $\Lambda$ always for $a$ save the first of datas which is $A_{i}$; in Wolf. the three signs vary at random; probably $\mathbb{A}$ or $\uparrow$ is orig. 2 sei, Pauli conj. set. 4 no doubt the orig. had sefei, cf. Osc. sifei. Both Bol. and Wolf. put a punct between i nom.

Pauli points out that the last words are those of a sepulchral insc., and that when the insc. was complete, cnatois probably stood alone in the last line, and probably in the middle: hence he ingeniously computes that, as the word now appears to begin a line, what we have left of the insc. is rather more than the right hand half, i.e. that about 11 letters are missing in the first four lines on the left. For his attempted restoration see Altit. Stud. v. p. 69.

What is the relation between the two copies? Pauli (ibid. p. 54) infers from several minutiae that the German copy is the parent of the other. The facts however appear to me to point the other way, for (1) Prof. von Heinemann tells me that the insc. 209 is written on p. 334 of the Gudian ms., while on p. 333, the reverse of the same leaf, occurs a note written in the same hand as all the rest of the ms. and beginning 'Bellorius explicat....'. Now since the Bol. ms. is dated 1629, and Bellori was only born in 1615, if the writer of that ms. used a German ms. containing or quoting a note of Bellori's, that scholar must have been - very remarkable schoolboy. (2) It is easy to see that Gude might omit such an obscure insc. as 210 , but it is not easy to see whence the Bol. scribe obtained 210, if his only authority for 209 was Wolf., nor (3) whence he learnt or why he invented the note that they both came from Sulmo, as to which Wolf, is silent. I believe therefore that Wolf. is a slightly amended copy of Bol., by a much
better scholar ${ }^{1}$, who saw, e.g., that the lines had all lost something on the left, and added dots in his copy to indicate the mutilation; and in the first word removed the dittograph of Bol.
U. D. p. 364 ff., Pauli l.c., Zvet. It. Med. 33.

## 210

 st ponties | $n$ ponties $\mid u$ alpis $\mid$ tr apidis | iouiois | puclois sest a plensst and ont in 1. 1, tr, iouiois, puclois, and the final lens are the only words given in capitals, but they show $\Gamma=p$ (in plens the $p$ is in cursive), $L=l, S=s, \|=e$, which no doubt is to be read in ponties also, though the copyist has both times transcribed it in cursive as $u$ ('pontius'); he left it as \| in sest but it appears that even there he took it for $u$, from his attempt at an explanation, of which the last line runs, 'pallis sustentandis auri plenam unciam solvit'! Bücheler (Umb. p. 116) would restore sestiatiens (cf. 252 inf .) or sestattens. For the deities here mentioned of. Venus Iouia, in a Latin inse. of Capua of 108 в.c. [W. M. L.] given in Eph. Ep. viII. 460, and 260 inf .

Mom. C. I. L. I. ${ }^{1}$ p. 555 , Zvet. It. Med. 32, Fabr. 2883 bis.

211 Found in the Contrada sotto l' Ara of la Badia Morronese and seen by me in the Museum at Sulmona in April 1894; published by de Nino Not. Scav. 1879, p. 147 ; facsim. Zvet. It. Med. v. 9.

## s loucies ss

In the centre of a block of stone $\cdot 23 \mathrm{~m}$. high and now $\cdot 76 \mathrm{~m}$. long, having lost some of its length at the beginning. The break has taken off the initial of the praenomen except that the line of the edge may be the second stroke of $V$ or $S$ (not the interpunct, which on this insc. is an ordinary dot, not the later characteristic Paelignian $\Delta$ ). The letters are .05 m . high in archaic Latin $a \beta(\lambda, L, \Omega=0, s$ half-way between $S$ and $S, \|=e)$; there is a horizontal line above and below, as in 206 etc. This seems far the most archaic of the Paelignian group.

Zvet. It. Med. 35.

[^58]212 From the Contrada Tricaglie e Vicenna of Bugnara near Sulmona, published by de Nino, Not. Scav. 1892, p. 170 ; in the Museum at Sulmona, April, 1894.

## вa loucia u

On a block of local limestone 63 m . long by $\cdot 19 \mathrm{~m}$. high, over a grave; the letters $\cdot 05 \mathrm{~m}$. high, in Lat. $a \beta$ with $\Lambda, S$ and $h=l$; interpunct injured, but seems to have been + , made with two cuts only: the letters have finials.

213 Found in la Badia Morronese; de Nino Not. Scav. 1879, December, whence C. I. L. Ix. p. 679 m ; in the Museum at Sulmona, April 1894.

## u loucies ob f

On a block of fine limestone 83 m . long by 85 broad, the letters handsomely cut with finials .06 m . high in Lat. $a \beta$ with $B=b, L=l$, and $\|=e$, but $F$ not $l$ !, and rounded $S$; interpunct is $x$ and + with two strokes only. $f=$ filius shows Latin influence.

Zvet. It. Med. 36.

214 Found in the Contrada Zappannotte near Sulmona, among tombs; published by de Nino Not. Scav. 1890, p. 222; in the Museum at Sulmona, April 1894.

## paci decries

On a cippus of local limestone with triangular summit, the whole 47 m . high by 4 m . broad, the slopes $\cdot 22 \mathrm{~m}$. long, the letters $\cdot 037 \mathrm{~m}$. high; Lat. a $\beta$ with $\mathbf{A} a, \| e, \Gamma p, R r, S s$, and curiously $\mathbb{Q}$ instead of $\mathrm{D}=d$, the reversed position being presumably due to the influence of either the Oscan or the 'E. Italic (Sabellic)' $\alpha \beta$; interp. triangular.

215 Found at Fonte d' Amore near la Badia Morronese; published by de Nino Not. Scav. April 1878; in the Museum at Sulmona, April 1894; facsim. Zvet. It. Med. v. 8.

## 1 peticis c

On local limestone in letters 05 m . high in Lat. $\alpha \beta$ of Ciceronian period, the ends of the letters carefully broadened, interp. triangular.

Zvet. It. Med. 34; C. I. L. IX. p. 290 footn.

## 2. Inscriptions of Corfinium (Pratola Peligna), 216-238.

216 Found in a grave at Pentima in 1877 by de Nino, and published simul. taneously by him in Not. Scav. 1877, p. 214, and Dressel, Bull. Inst. Arch. Rom. 1877, p. 184. It is now in the Naples Museum, where I read it in March 1894. The best reproductions are on the whole those of Dressel l.c. and Pauli (from a paper impression and cast) Altit. Stud. v. taf. i, but none are perfectly accurate, see below. I hnve followed 'Thurneysen's stopping, save in the last line, where I do not feel certain enough of the meaning to punctuate at all.

On a side-face of a large flat block of travertine, the usual shape in Paelignian epitaphs, 2 ft .7 in . ( 785 m .) long, 2 ft .5 in. from front to back, and now at the broadest point of the face, $11 \frac{1}{4} \mathrm{in}$. ( 281 m .) high, but about $11 \frac{1}{2}$ ( 288 m .) before the rounding of the upper edges by wear, to judge from the thickness of the body of the block; the letters $1 \frac{1}{8} \mathrm{in}$. ( 028 m .) high. The first line is almost entirely worn away; the left edge has a break extending over all lines but the last, the right is worn round at the end of 11.1 and 2 , and has lost a fragment at the end of 11.4 and 5 , but is otherwise complete since 11.3 and 6 end well within the margin, and the last letters of $11.2,5$ (and probably 4) are made smaller, clearly for want of room. I see no reason whatever for thinking that the stone has suffered any serious mutilation.

Pauli, judging from plaster and paper impressions of the face of the stone, supposed that parts of it had been sawn away on the top and to the right. I do not think he would have been led to this conclusion if he had seen the original. All the four top edges and corners of the block are well rounded by wear, and the upper surface is slightly uneven, just as one would expect in the top of a stone long exposed to the weather; hence, if it has ever been used by builders it must long since have been turned out again; and further the distance of the mean surface of the stone above the level at which 1.1 becomes legible is quite enough to leave room for the missing half of that line. Again, although the left-hand vertical edge is broken at the face, a few inches back the side becomes quite flat and even with the bottom of the edge at the face, though it has not the appearance of having been recently cut; and the fact that when the broken letters on the left of the insc. are restored they stand directly above one another ${ }^{1}$ and in a line with the first letter of 1.7 where the

[^59]margin is complete, shows conclusively that we have here the true margin; for the insc. is not aroix $\eta \delta^{\circ}{ }^{2}$, nor is there any other point in the whole length where a vertical could be drawn through the lines without cutting more than one letter. Further, although the translation of the insc. as a whole is not yet certain, there is quite enough probability in Thurneysen's and Lindsay's versions (far more, indeed, than in Pauli's daring 'restoration') to make us content with the lines as they stand. Finally, it builders did remove this (certainly sepulchral and) somewhat unwieldy stone from its original position, why did their successors (who, we are to believe, turned it out of the house again) carefully remove all traces of mortar and put it back in a grave, like the miser in The Family Pen? Why, indeed!

## ......racom..............................

## usur, pristafalacirix prismu petieđu ip viđadu uibđu omnitu uranias ecuc empratois

## .lisuist; cerfum sacaracirix semunu sva. <br> 5 aetatu firata fertlid praicime perseponas afded. eite uus pritrome pacris puus ecic lexe lifar dida uus deti hanustu herentas.

The $a \beta$ is Latin of the Sullan or Ciceronian period at Rome, with $A, C, E, L, M, P$ and $P, S, T, T$ and $T$, and $V$ varying to $V$, the strokes being all carefully broadened towards their extremities. The interpunct is the characteristic Paelignian tricusp (but see note to ll. 6 and 7 below), omitted only at the ends of the lines and after cerfum, fertlid, pritrome and pacris.
l. 1 after 4 letters' space the lower half of a hasta, then racom is clear though its upper half is gone; pra-, tra-, iraare possible, the first looks like Umb. praco pracatarum. 2 before 1 room for one letter of which a small slanting stroke is left, either $\mathbf{u}$ or $\mathbf{x}$; ad fin. the small $\mathbf{d}$ is followed by an obscure trace of a small $\mathbf{u}$ on the worn edge, which is now generally so read. 3 before $\mathbf{i}$ is now left only a tiny, wedge-like end of a stroke, at the top of the line, with its upper edge pointing just above the horizontal towards the right and measuring $\frac{1}{8} \mathrm{in}$., while the lower cuts it at an angle of about $30^{\circ}$ and is $\frac{3}{16} \mathrm{in}$. long; it cannot, I think, be anything but the extremity of $\mathbf{u}$;
the crown or finial of this letter is regularly $\frac{3}{16} \mathrm{in}$. broad (so that the $\frac{1}{8} \mathrm{in}$. of breadth that is left is well within the mark) and the inclination of the crown varies both above and below the horizontal, that of the last $\mathbf{u}$ in 1.4 being exactly like this tip. Pauli's representation of this with a squarish, blunt end turned directly towards the right is misleading, and after careful examination of the stone, I could find no vestige of a similar mark which he found in his cast (and de Nino on the stone) at the foot of the line ; if it ever really existed, it must have been too faint to be reckoned as original, or to justify the reading c or e which Pauli prefers. 4 before 1 is a tiny corner, the end either of a hasta or horizontal bar; ad fin. a small $\mathbf{d}$ is perhaps faintly discernible, but far from certain, on the rounded edge. 5 init. a probable, $\mathbf{r}$ possible. 6 init. a certain. The punct after afded as after lexe in 1.7 is circular and quite distinct from the regular tricusp used elsewhere. Lindsay plausibly regards it as a full stop.

Thurneysen, $R h . M$. xliII. (1888), p. 347, and following him, with additions, Lindsay, Class. Rev. 7 (1893), p. 103. For earlier attempts to explain the inscr. v. Pauli, Altit. Stud. v, Bugge, Altit. Stud. p. 61, Büch. Rh. M. xxxin. (1878), p. 271, Dressel, Bull. Inst. Arch. Rom. xlix. (1878), p. 184.

Zvet. It. Med. 11 Tab. iii. 1.

217 First published by de Nino, Bull. Inst. Arch. Rom. 1882, p. 190 ; now in the museum at Pentima, where I saw it, April 1894.

## saluta scaifia | anceta cerri

Carefully cut in similar style, but in larger letters ( $1 \frac{3}{4} \mathrm{in}$.) than the preceding insc., on a complete block of fine local limestone 67 m . long by -22 high ( 27 by $8 \frac{3}{4}$ in.). See the note to 206.

Zvet. It. Med. 26, C. I. L. IX. p. 679, o.

218 Found in 1879 at Pentima, and first published in Not. Scav. for August of that year; now in the museum at Pentima, where I saw it in April 1894; Zvet. It. Med. iii. 2.

## pes pros ecuf incubat | casnar oisa aetate | c anaes solois des forte | faber

On a block of stone, 22 in . long, $21 \frac{1}{2} \mathrm{in}$. from front to back, 11 in . high, the letters $1 \frac{1}{16} \mathrm{in}$. high, in Latin $a \beta$ of exactly the same style as 216 save that in this $t$ is always $T$, the interp. a tricusp varying with trefoil. The last word stands alone in the middle of 1.4. For varying interpretations see Bücheler, Rhein. Mus. 35 (1880), p. 495, Thurneysen, ib. 43 (1888), p. 353 , Pauli, Altit. Stud. v. p. 46 ff.

Zvet. It. Med. 12, C. I. L. Ix. p. 678.

219 Found in 1876 in the contrada Colle S. Angelo, a part of the ancient Corfinium, and seen by me in the 'Palazzo Municipale' of Pratola Peligna in 1894. First published by Dressel, Bull. Inst. Arch. Rom. 1877, p. 182 ff.; facsim. from an impression by de Nino, Zvet. It. Med. vi. 2.

## medix aticus | biam locatin | p sadries $\mathrm{t} \mid$ v popdis $t$

On a basis of travertine $17 \frac{1}{2} \mathrm{in}$. long by $13 \frac{1}{2} \mathrm{in}$. high ( 44 by 34 m .), broken unevenly along the top of 1 . 1 , but cut evenly some distance below 1.4 and therefore complete at the bottom; at the two sides also enough margin is left to show that each of the lines we have is complete ${ }^{1}$. The letters vary from $1 \frac{1}{2}$ to $\frac{1}{4} \mathrm{in}$. in height, and show much the same Lat. $a \beta$ as 216, save for a slightly rougher and perhaps earlier character ( $C$ instead of $C$, $\Gamma$ instead of $P$ ).

Interpunct circular, absent at the ends of the lines and after $\mathbf{p}$ in 1. 3. The finials are not well made. 1.1 t slightly damaged but clear. 2 locatin seems to me clear, though the horizontal of 1 is rather long and reaches under the 0 , whence some thought it accidental and read ioc3 p might possibly be f .

Pauli, Altital. Stud. v. p. 40. Büch. Bull. Inst. Arch. Rom. 1877, p. 236, and Rhein. Mus. 1878, p. 41. Zvet. It. Med. 31.

[^60]
## 220－238 Single name epitaphs．

Pauli has pointed out（Altit．Stud．v．p． 22 ff ．）that these inscc．fall into two main groups，according as they are without or with a cognomen， the former being of course the earlier．All but two（one in each group） add the praeromen of the father or patron，and some add to this $f$＇filius＇ or $l$＇libertus．＇They are here arranged in this order，which corresponds very well with the character of their writing．

223－4 are only preserved in a copy；the rest were all found near Pratola and first published by de Nino，and all save 232 （which seems to be lost）were seen by me in the Museum at Pentima in April 1894．More precise details of their discovery may be sought in Not．Scav．ll．cc．Their alpbabet is Latin，and that of 220 seems older than the rest，none of which are likely to be older than 150 B．C．，since they all have a rectangular $l$ and finials more or less developed．

220
Found S．W．of Pratola；Not．Scav．1878，p．300．The break seems to point to $L$ rather than $L, \Gamma p, \vee u$ ，no finials，interp．tricusp； 28 in ．square， $5 \frac{1}{2} \mathrm{in}$ ． high，letters $2 \frac{1}{2}$ in．high．Zvet．It．Med．20，C．I．L．Ix．p． $298 f$.

## u plauties u

221 Not．Scav． 1878 August；finials not elaborate，interp．tricusp；161 in．long， $8 \frac{1}{2} \mathrm{in}$ ．high， $23 \frac{1}{2} \mathrm{in}$ ．front to back，letters 2 in ．high，save 0 which is $1 \frac{1}{2} \mathrm{in}$ ．only． Zvet．It．Med．17，C．I．L．Ix．p． 298 e．

## u obelies no

222 Not．Scav． 1879 June；finials slight，interp．tricusp；18⿺⿻十⺝丶⿱丶万⿱⿰㇒一乂 in．long， $19 \frac{1}{2}$ in． front to back， $8 \frac{3}{4} \mathrm{in}$ ．high，the letters 2 in ．high，save which is $1 \frac{1}{2}$ only．Zvet． It．Med． 19.

## saluta obel ou

223， 224 MS．in Naples Library（rec．emptorum 344）where they are cited from a book by Mascitti（17th cent．）；Zvet．It．Med．28，C．I．L．Ix．p． 298 g．

## $223 n$ uibedis $n$

$224 t$ ualesies 1

225 Not. Scav. 1880 April ; finials slight, interp. a cross $(\times) ; 33 \frac{1}{2}$ in. square by 10 in . high. Zvet. It. Med. 25, C. I. L. Ix. p. $679 n$.

## ob ouiedis 1

226 Not. Scav. 1878 Aug.; finials slight, interp. tricusp; 25 in . long, 21 in . front to back, 6 录 in. high. Zvet. It. Med. 16, C. I. L. Ix. p. $298 a$.

## uib ania mar

227 Not. Scav. 1877, Sept. and 1880, p. 383; finials slight, interp. tricusp; 17 in. long, 16 in. front to back, 8 in. high. C. I. L. Ix. 3196, but cf. Pauli, Altit. Stud. v. p. 23 (Acca = Accaua?).

## saluta acca 1

228 Not. Scav. Oct. 1880 ; finials elaborate, interp. tricusp, $P=b$. On a stele $16 \frac{1}{4} \mathrm{in}$. high, $10 \frac{1}{2}$ in. broad, 4 to 6 in. thick, letters $1 \frac{1}{8} \mathrm{in}$. high, C. I. L. Ix. 6334.
suntla | sabdia nutr

229 Found in April 1894, when I saw it; rather carelessly cut, interp. tricusp, $\|=e, \zeta=s, L=l ; 23 \mathrm{in}$. long, $19 \frac{1}{2} \mathrm{in}$. front to back, $9 \frac{1}{4} \mathrm{in}$. high. Published in Not. Scav. 1894, p. 195, where tatius is wrongly given.

## 1 taties 1 f

230 Not. Scav. Oct. 1880 ; finials slight and often absent, interp. tricusp; $25 \frac{1}{2}$ in. long, $22 \frac{1}{2} \mathrm{in}$. front to back, $4 \frac{1}{2} \mathrm{in}$. high. Zvet. It. Med. 24, C. I. L. Ix. p. 679 q.

## min rufries ou 1

231 Not. Scav. Aug. 1878; interp. tricusp, $20 \frac{1}{2} \mathrm{in}$. square, $8 \frac{1}{2} \mathrm{in}$. high, letters $1_{\frac{5}{18}} \mathrm{in}$. high. Zvet. It. Med. 18, C. I. L. Ix. p. 298 d.

## a ofturies m 1

232 Not. Seav. Oct. 1880; of the same size and style as 227, but now seemingly lost; Zvet. It. Med. 21, C. I. L. Ix. p. 679 l.

## st apunies t l

232 bis Found at Pentima in January 1896. Text from an impression kindly sent me by De Nino:

## ter loucia 11

a and $t$ are rectangular, the first $l$ is all but so, the last two quite so, though as only their lower halves are left it is conceivable that we should read ee or el.

233 Not. Scav. June 1879; interp. tricusp; at the top of a cippus $24 \frac{1}{2} \mathrm{in}$. high, $11 \frac{3}{4} \mathrm{in}$. broad, letters $1 \frac{1}{2} \mathrm{in}$. high; C. I. L. Ix. 6335 . Wholly Latin?

## uibia sullia 1 f

234 Not. Scav. 1879, p. 318, C.I.L. Ix. p. $679 p$; for $p(e)$ truna, cf. note to 272 inf.
uib ptruna | uf

235 Not. Scav. April 1878 ; finials slight, interp. a rough trefoil ( Nace $^{2}$ ) instead of the usual tricusp, $\vee u, L l ; 24 \mathrm{in}$. long, 21 in . front to back, 9 in . high. Zvet. It. Med. 13, C. I. L. IX. p. 298 c.

## c heleuis 1 | rustix

236 Not. Scav. Oct. 1880; finials careful, interp. half-way between triangle and trefoil; the last $\mathbf{I}$ but one is put in the lap of 1 to save room. 24 in . long, $21 \frac{1}{4} \mathrm{in}$. front to back, 9 in . high. Zvet. It. Med. 22, C. I. L. Ix. p. 679 h.

## u aniaes u calauan

237 Ibid.; handsome finials, interp. tricusp; $29 \frac{1}{2} \mathrm{in}$. long, 23 in . front to back, $6 \frac{1}{2} \mathrm{in}$. high, letters $2 \frac{1}{2} \mathrm{in}$. high. Zvet. It. Med. 20, C. I. L. Ix. p. 679 i.
c anniaes c char

238 Not. Scav. Aug. 1878; finials very marked, interp. tricusp, the only Paelignian insc. yet found with ligatures; $24 \frac{3}{4} \mathrm{in}$. long, $18 \frac{1}{2}$ in. front to back, $8 \frac{1}{2} \mathrm{in}$. high, letters $2 \frac{3}{3} \mathrm{in}$. high. Zvet. It. Med. 15, C. I. L. Ix. p. 298 b.

## t heleuis herclit

239. Inscription of Molina.

Found at Molina between Sulmona and Aquila, on the left or E. bank of the Aternus; first published by Dressel, Bull. Inst. Arch. Rom. 1877, p. 177, and said to be at Aquila in the 'Prefettura,' where in April 1894 I failed to find it after half-an-hour's laborious search in a cellar crammed with valuable Lat. inscc. piled anyhow, and surmounted by a heap of rotten furniture. Like other dialect insce., I expect it has taken wings. The text is from Zvet.'s facsim. It. Med. v. 7.

## a......|t nounis | l alafis c| herec fesn | upsaseter | coisatens.

Lat. a $\beta$, like that of 216 , but perhaps rather later and less carefully cut ( $T$ and $T, P, E, F$ ) across the top of a stone about 1 m . high and 29 broad ( 40 in . by $11 \frac{3}{4}$ ); the top line, Dressel says, was rather decayed than broken, so that the insc. is probably otherwise complete; the interp. is a cross (×). Buich. Rh. Mus. 32 (1877), p. 640 has a note on the insc. Zvet. It. Med. 29.

Note Exv. $a$ On a stone built into the back of the-apse of the Cattedrale di Valva in Pentima, where I saw it in April 1894; Not. Scav. 1878, p. 96. Some letters may be lost to the right of 0 .

$$
\text { Al) } \cdots 丁 \leq 0
$$

$b$ On a huge flat block of stone in the Museum at Pentima (subsequently used to cover in a drain) are four straggling signs, the largest being about 8 in. long.
vcSO
c On the base of a small vase 038 m . high, found in a grave (Not. Scav. 1879, p. 182); in April 1894 in the Museum at Pentima. The upper half of the second sign is broken.

$$
\triangle b N Y
$$

$d$ and e. On two lids, ibid.

$$
\text { (d) bato }(\lambda=a), \quad \text { (e) accal } l \text { (ef. 227). }
$$

Note axvi. On a block of travertine, $27 \frac{1}{2} \mathrm{in}$. long, 21 in . front to back, $8 \frac{1}{2} \mathrm{in}$. high, letters $2 \frac{1}{2} \mathrm{in}$. high, in the best Lat. $a \beta$, seen by me at Pentima; Not. Scav. Oct. 1880. Zvet. It. Med. 23, C. I. L. Ix. p. 679 k .

```
arghillus | salauatur.
```


## 240 Paelignian Gloss.

According to Ovid, Fasti 3. 95, the month sacred to Mars among the Paelignians was the fourth of the year: see below s.v. Mamers 309 (Sabine Glosses) A.

Compare also the curious word callita- 241 C inf.

## 241 Place-names ${ }^{1}$ of the Paeligni ${ }^{2}$.

A. Well attested in form, date and locality.

Paeligni, -nus inscc. Pēl- cl.
Sulmō masc., -ōnensis cl. inscc. Sulmona, but till lately Solm-.
Corfīnĭum, -iensis cl. inscc.
Aternus Fl. v. 250 (Vestini) A. Aterno $f$.
Superaequum, -quani cl. inscc. Castel-Vecchio Subequo.
Lauernae C. I. L. Ix. 3138, Plut. Sull. 6 ( $\Lambda a \beta$-).
Interpromium (-promum, -bromum) Itinn. -minus pagus C. I. L. Ix. 3046, cf. p. 286.

## B. Less certain.

Boedinus pagus (Superaequi) C. I. L. Ix. 3311.
Vecellanus pagus (Superaequi?) C. I. L. Ix. 3305.
${ }^{1}$ For the arrangement and notation see the List of Signs and Abbreviations.
${ }^{1}$ For the tables of the Itineraries among the Paeligni, v. C.I.L. Ix. pp. 203-4.

## C. Doubtful.

Betifulum ?C. I. L. Ix. 3088.
Callita? on an insc, found in the neighbourhood of Sulmo and published by de Nino, Not. Scav. 1887, p. 159 callita $[m]$ callibus iti, ni iniuriam acipiatis. The last letter of the first word has only the lower half of a hasta left on the stone, and might be $i$ or $e$, and the whole word may not be a place-name at all.

## D. Further Modern Names.

Scanno, Morrone M., Pacentro, Pettorano sul Gizio, Pentima, Pratola Peligna, Prezza, Popoli, Tremonti, Tocco da Casauria, Molina, Acciano.
242. Personal Names ${ }^{1}$ of the Paeligni ${ }^{2}$.
A. Frequent.

1. Nomina.
gens Acca fem. sup.
Accia
Annia sup.
Aufidia
Claudia

Cornelia
Heluia sup.
Iulia
Lucceia (once Luceia)
Lucilia (once -cill-)

Maria
Octauia cf. inf. Satria
Varia Vibia inf.
2. Among the Cognomina may be mentioned

Paelinus
Rufus, $l$.
Vibius, -a praen. sup.
B. Less Frequent.

1. Nomina.

| $\begin{gathered} \text { gens Accaa } \\ \text { Accaua }^{3} \end{gathered}$ | $\frac{\text { Alfia }}{\text { Allia }} \text { cf. sup. }$ | Annaua(twice Annaa, once Anna) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Acria | Ampia | Anniolena |
| Aelia | Ancilia | Antonia |

${ }^{1}$ For the arrangement and notation see the List of Signs and Abbreviations.
${ }^{2}$ From C. I. L. Ix. 3043-3335, 6319-6346, 6408 A-6412 A, etc.
${ }^{3}$ Compare Vibius Accaeus (al. Accaus) Liv. 25. 14.

| Arruntia | Iunia | Pompullia |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ateia | Lampridia | Pontia sup. |
| Atilia | Laronia | Pulfidia |
| Attia | Liuia |  |
| Attiedia (once, and | Lollia | Rutilia <br> Salauia inf. |
| once Ati-) inf. | Luria (one insc.) | Saluidia |
| Auillia | Magia | Scaefia l. sup. |
| Brittia | Mammia (twice | Sentia |
| Caecilia | Mamm- once Mam-) | Septimia |
| Caedia (once Caeid-) | Massidia (one insc.) Messio | Seueria |
| Caesia |  | Statia inf. |
| Ceruia | Mettia | Suetedia l., (once |
| Clodia | Ninnia (once Ninia) | Suethedia) |
| Dasimia | inf. | Sulmonia |
| $\overline{\text { Decimia }}$ | Numisia inf. | Tattia (twice Tatia, |
| Decria (also in Not. | Obellia l. sup. | sup.) |
| Scav. 1878, p. 318) | Obidia | Tedia |
| Fadia | Opsidia | Titia, inf. |
| Flacceia | Ostoria | Veibedia (Vib-, once |
| Flauia | Peticia | each) |
| Fuficia | Petidia | Venetia |
| Gauia | Petruculeia | Vettia |
| Herennia (once -enia) | Pettia | Vettienal. |
|  |  | Vlpia |

2. Among the Cognomina.

Gritto
Pansa
Proculus

Saluius praen. Saluta sup.

Saturninus
Vrsulus
C. Once only.

1. Numina.

| gens Acilia |
| :--- |
| Alfidia |
| Ammaa |
| Anteia |
| Apesia, $l$ |
| Attidia |
| Auelia |


| Auidia | Caetronia |
| :--- | :--- |
| Aurelia | Capria |
| Baebia | Caucia |
| Bennia, l. | Clauia? |
| Bittia | Consia |
| Cadia | Corfinia |
| Caerellia | Dannia |


| Decia | Nonia cf. sup. | Spedia inf. |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Domitia | Ofilia | Staia inf. |
| Dullia | Opsia inf. | Statilia |
| Gaidia (i.e. Gauid-) | Ouidia | Sullia i.e.sup. |
| Honoria | Paccia | Tetidia |
| Hortensia | Pedia | Tettia sup. |
| Laelia | Pompeia | Tettidia |
| Licinia | Pomponia $l$. | Titecia |
| Maecia | Poppidia | Titilia |
| Maia inf. | Raia | Vercia |
| Marcia | Refidia | Vesclaria |
| Mat[ia] | Rufria sup. | Vettedia $l$. |
| Modia | Salania | Vettiedia $l$. |
| Mussidia cf. sup. | Seruilia | Vittedia $l$. |
| Nassia | Siluia | Vrbiculia |

## 2. Among the Cognomina.

| Adauta | Cogessus | Lappa, vio |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Ambibulus | Dama | Naso |
| Baetus | Decembrius? l. | Olus $^{\text {¹ }}$ |
| Bassus | Deuera $l$. | Polla $^{\text {Bato, i.e. sup. }}$ |
| Bradua | Egloge | Sabdia i.e. sup. |
| Camars | Frentio | Saluius cogn. |
| Canio | Gauianus | Scinus |
| Cerialis | Ianuarius | Vibius, -a cogn. |

1 This name I noted in some recently discovered insc., but have lost the reference.

## B. Marrucini.

For the history of the Marrucini, whose only centre was Teate, see p. 233 sup. and C. I. L. IX. p. 282. In their territory there was at one time a settlement of Illyrian invaders, from whom came the very ancient insc. of Grecchio, formerly regarded as Italic ; cf. the note to 25 A sup. and the Appendix; and see further Pauli Veneter, p. z22. The oldest Latin inscc. of Chieti are C. I. L. Ix. 3028 and 3036 ; the former has the I longa, the latter 'litteris antiquioribus' uses doubled consonants quite regularly; and neither is likely to be older than Ciceromian times. The date of the actual Marrucine inscc. is discussed below.

## 243 The Bronze of Rapino.

Found about a mile S.E. of Rapino (ten miles S. of Chieti) in the western district of the Marrucini bordering on Frentanum in what is known as the Grotta del colle in Citta Danzica, which must have been the graveyard of an ancient town. The inscription was published in 1841, but for the first time correctly by Mommsen in Ann. Inst. Arch. Rom. 1846, p. 82, and the original is now in the Berlin Museum of Antiquities. The text is from Treu's facsim. in Zvet. Inscc. It. Med. Diall. ii. 2, which is the fruit of repeated study of the bronze by him and Dr Max Fränkel, and is almost identical with Mommsen's, so that its accuracy cannot reasonably be doubted. The punctuation is Deecke's save in ll. 9 and 11, where it seems at present wiser to put none.

Lightly and somewhat carelessly engraved with a sharp tool, on a small, rather rusty bronze tablet, about 6 in . ( 15 m .) square. A loop of iron by which it could be suspended is attached to the middle of the upper edge. The date is fixed about 250 b.c. by the coins found in the neighbouring graves, which included some from Aesernia ( 185 sup.) founded in 263 b.C., and the latest of Teanum ( $150 d$ sup.) later than 268 b.c., but on the other hand four heavy cast quadrantes and sextantes, which ceased to be coined about that date, and no
aisos pacris, totai | maroucai lixs. | asignas ferenter | 4, 5, 6, 7, auiatas toutai | maroucai, ioues | patres ocres tarin|cris iouias agine | iafc esuc agine asum | babu .poleenis feret| 10,11,12 regen.. peai cerie iouia | pacrsi. eituam amaten|s uenalinam nita.a nipis pedi suam.
strictly Roman silver or copper, which became common in Italy by about 200 b.c.

This date ( $2 \check{2} 0$ B.c.) is confirmed by the $a \beta$, which is Latin and resembles that of the earliest coins of Aesernia, with $\wedge a$, $\langle c,\|e,\| f,<g, \downarrow l,\rangle_{o}$. This insc. therefore gives us perhaps the earliest example of the sign for $g$; Mom. U. D. p. 32 gives two early examples, one of which (the 'as of Luceria') I cannot identify, and the other is an insc. now generally admitted to be later than it professes.

The difficulty with which this insc. has been deciphered by successive scholars is in part due to the frequency of small superfluous strokes on the original, for which the carelessness of the engraver and the sharpness of his tool seem to be responsible. Only a few of them occur at the end of words, viz., after ferenter (l. 3), toutai (1.4), ioues (1.5), iouias (l. 7), babu (1.9), where the stroke is vertical, not inclined as the rest are, and stands in the middle of a considerable space between the two words, rather nearer to poleenis), and nipis (1.12). There are sixteen others scattered about, which are obviously meaningless; most of them are first attempts at the proper stroke, others, e.g. after the e of esuc, and the am of amatens, perhaps misplaced interpuncts.

1. 9, Mommsen suggested [a]poleenis, and there is now a blank space before the $\mathbf{p}$ with the hasta just mentioned. The last three lines $(10-12)$ are injured by corrosion. 10 , there is space after regen for two letters which Deecke reasonably restores [ai]. Of the next word pe and $i$ seem clear with a slight stroke left between the e and i sloping upwards from left to right, so that the restoration peai is obvious. Zvet., following preceding editors, prints piai. cerie seems clear, not cerei.

Dke. puts a comma here. 12, ni ta[g]a Dke., ta[h]a W. M. Lindsay, comparing Volsc. atahus : there is plenty of room for a letter between and a. Dke. puts a comma after nipis. The last line is crowded and i mam is written along the righthand margin.

Büch. Lex. It. passim, also Umb. p. 89, Deecke, Rh. Mus. xli. (1886) p. 196, Corssen, K. Z. ix. (1860) p. 133, Bugge, Altit. St. p. 41 and $K . Z$. xxii. (1874) p. 464. U. D. pp. 336, 340. Zvet. 1t. Med. 6 (the glossary quotes at length from Büch., Bugge and Corssen), It. Inf. 8 (with Deecke's note in the App.), F. 2741.

244 On a square stone found among the ruins of a church at Chieti, and first published by Mom. Bull. Inst. Arch. Rom. 1847, p. 154, from a copy by Sign. Ulrico Valia, thence $U . D . x y$. , but now lost.

## u alies 1 | as alies as

In the same Lat. $a \beta$ as the preceding. U. D. p. 339, Zyet. It. Med. 7, Fabr. 2893.

Note Xxvii. A small fragment of red tile (C. I. L. $\mathrm{I}^{1}$ 1274, rx. 2794), broken into a diamond shape with 4 in . and 3 in . diagonals, was found in Pietrabbondante by Sign. Cremonese and by him presented to the Naples Museum in 1887 (no. 116079), after having been published by Avellino and Garrucci, whose facsimiles are given C. I. L. l.c. Neither of them ventured a transcript, and I think their facsimiles err on the side of seeing too much. The tile bears four lines of broken writing in archaic Lat. $\alpha \beta$, identical with that of the preceding insc. save for $E$ instead of II. Even with the aid of a good paper impression, and repeated comparison with the original in Naples, I am confident of very little; still, the letters in the transcript below which are not underlined may be taken as reasonably certain. An interpunct is tolerably clear in each line.

```
s sum. | tura da | u blaio. |
.eta su.. | t
```

In $1.1 m$ may be $n i, 2 a$ may be $e, 3$ the letter before $l$ may be $p$ or $f$ or $b, 4$ before e possibly $a$, after $u$ perhaps $u$ or $l$. The gens Blaia appears in Samnite and Volscian territory ( $\mathbf{1 8 8} \mathrm{C}, 257 \mathrm{~B}$ ). I cannot tell to what language the fragment belongs.

## 245 Place-names ${ }^{1}$ of the Marrucini ${ }^{2}$.

The Southern boundary of this tribe is doubtful. Strabo (5.4.2) puts it far enough North to include Ortona in the Frentani; Pliny (3. 12. 106) extends the Frentani as far North as the Aternus, Ptolemy (3. 1. 16) on the contrary puts their N. boundary S. of 'इápov тотаной ékßoдai,' though he includes this and Ortano in Paelignian territory, giving the mouths of the Aternus and Matrinus (still further N.) to the Marrucini.
A. Well attested in form, date and locality.

Marrūcīni cl.
Tēāte neut., -ātini cl. inscc. (but Teates $30 \alpha$ supr. from Teanum Apulum). Chieti.

## C. Doubtful.

Clocoris Fl. Tab. Peut.
[ad] Noceios? Tab. Peut.
Пo入入it८ov? Diod. Sic. 19. 105 ad fin. (taken by the Romans in 310 в.c.).
D. Further Modern Names.

Manoppello, Alento F., Foro F., Arielli F., Bucchianico, Moro F.

[^61]
## 246 Personal Names ${ }^{1}$ of the Marrucini ${ }^{2}$.

## A. Frequent.

1. Nomen.
gens Mamilia
B. Less frequent.
2. Nomina.

| gens Asinia |  |  |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| Caesia | Octauia <br> Petronia | Trebia inf. |
| Lucceia | Popaedia | Vettia |

2. Among the Cognomina may be mentioned

Proculus
C. Once only.

1. Nomina.

| gens Ateia | Flauia | Plautia |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Aufidia $?$ | Heluidia | Pontia, $l$. |
| Auidia | Herenia | Publicia |
| Betulia | Iulia | Saleuia |
| Caelia | Mettia | (Seueriana) |
| Cottia, $l$. | Naeuia | Sontia |
| Decuria, $l$. | Ninnia inf. | Sulpicia |
| Dusmia | Oppia inf. | Titia, $l$. |

2. Among the Cognomina.

Bassus
Cerialis (spelt Cae-)

Hirrutus
Rufus

Salassus
${ }^{1}$ For the arrangement and notation see the List of Signs and Abbreviations.
${ }^{2}$ From C. I. L. ix. 3012--3042, 6316-6318 etc.
C.

## C. Vestini.

We have seen that this tribe, which occupied the Eastern and Northern bank of the Aternus, entered into the Roman alliance, retaining their own independence, in 304 B.c. A Northerly section round Amiternum near the passes into Sabine country probably received the Caerite franchise soon after. In spite of this, and of the influence of Hadria (a Latin colony founded about 290 B.C., Liv. Epit. xi.), the local dialect survived certainly to the middle of the 2nd century b.c. (see the notes to the following inscc.), and probably until the Social war. The oldest Latin inscc. of the district are C. I. L. IX. 3521 ( $=$ Pr. L. M. E. Lxiv. H), from Furfo with Sullan $a \beta$, and 3574 'litteris antiquissimis,' but with couraverunt, a form which as intermediate between coir- or coer- and cur-, cannot be earlier than 100 b.c. (Ritschl, Opusc. Iv. 765). The latter insc. contains also the forms magist[r]es (nom. pl.) and ueci (gen. sg.), which show that the Latin first spoken by the Vestini was not that of Rome, but of their neighbours the Marsians and Aequians, cf. 264 inf. 248 (see the note) shows that at the time at which it was written the Upper Aternus valley must be counted Vestine, not Sabine, in point of dialect.

## 247-8. Inscriptions of the Aternus valley.

Found in the church S. M. in Gerulis near the village Navelli (about 15 miles from Popoli to the N. of the Pescara valley), and first published in 1864; now in the Naples Museum, where I saw it in March, 1894; Zvet. It. Med. II. 4.

## t uetio | duno | didet | herclo 5, 6, 7 iouio | brat | data

$\cdot 25 \mathrm{~m}$. broad by $\cdot 62 \mathrm{~m}$. high, the letters 2 in . high, clearly but roughly cut in archaic Lat. $a \beta$ with $\lambda=\alpha,\|=e,\|^{\prime}=f, L=l, \quad()=0, \quad K=r$, showing, broadly, the same features as the bronze of Rapino without the angular and other peculiarities due to the material on which the latter is engraved, and presumably therefore dating from much the same period. Beneath each line of letters is drawn a horizontal stroke across the face of the insc. as in 206 sup. There is an interp. in 1. 1.
C. I. L. IX. 3414, Biich. ibid., Zvet. It. Med. 9, Fabr. 2871 bis.

248 Found at the end of the XVIII century and first published by Lanzi Saggio d. ling. Etruscal, II. p. 618, who stated that it had been found at Scoppito, a town not far from Aquila, while Amati, writing soon after it was found (quoted by Mom. U. D. p. 339), had 'reasons to think the insc. Marsian,' which he did not explain (see below). It is now in the town-hall of Aquila, where $I$ saw it in April, 1894 : Zvet. It. Med. vi. 3.

## .... | mesene | flusare | poimunien | atrno | aunom | hiretum

On a stone cippus 13 in . broad, now $20 \frac{1}{2} \mathrm{in}$. high ( 325 m . by $\cdot 512$ ) measured from the point where it begins to be shaped, a broader base below, which stood in the ground, having been left rough. It is irregularly written, the letters varying from $1 \frac{1}{2}$ to 2 in . high in Lat. $\alpha \beta$ of the first half or the middle of the 2nd century B.C., decidedly more advanced than in the last two inscc. ( $L, A, R$, but $T, E, H$ fully squared, $O$ full size, $S$ rounded, $\Gamma$ as in Gracchan inscc. like the Tabula Bantina). The top of the stone is lost, and probably contained the names of the offerers. 1. $3 \mathrm{n}, \mathrm{I}$ think, is certain, though the last stroke is on the broken edge. 4 was read atrat by Mom., but the stone must have been thoroughly cleaned on its insertion in the wall of the town-hall, and $\mathbf{I}$ was quite clear to me, and the shallow stroke above it, which Mom. took for the cross of $t$, certainly accidental. The stone is broken in the middle of the following sign, which appears now as ${ }^{-1}$ on the edge, so that $0, S$ and $\mathbf{c}$ are possible; the former is clearly more probable intrinsically. In the next line a is perfectly clear, exactly like the a above it, save that it is a little larger, so that both $\mathbf{d}$ and $l$ are out of the question.

For a similar offering cf. 265 inf.
The correction in 1. 4, taken together with the phonetic characteristics of the insc., settles at once the doubt as to its provenance. Offerings would hardly be made to a river-god on the far side of such mountains as lie between the Aternus and the basin of L. Fucinus, and hence we may infer that this insc. comes either from Scoppito or from some spot even nearer the bed of the Aternus. Further, the dialect of this insc. presents no discrepancies from that of the two preceding inscc., whereas the preservation of the diphthongs and the change of $\bar{o}$ to $\bar{u}$ (Poimunien) are foreign to the Marsian inscc. (260-268 inf.) and the latter to the Sabine Glosses (Feronia, sol) 309 inf. We need therefore feel little hesitation in referring this insc. to the N. Oscan group.

Biicheler apud Zvet. It. Med. 8, U. D. p. 339, Zvet. l.c., Fabr. 2737.

## 249 Coins of the Vestini.

## ves

Bronze coins, probably cast at Pinna or Aternum; Lat. $a \beta$ with both S and S, 301-2688.c.; types from Umbria and Picenum. Head p. 20, Garrucci p. 33. Beschr. Berl. p. 15.

Note xxviii. (a) C. I. L. Ix. 3513 from Furfo ( 58 b.c.) contains two or three forms which are or may be strictly local and are printed below in heavy type. Unfortunately the stone is as corrupt as in second-rate ms.; it appears to have been originally engraved by some one almost ignorant of Latin, from a not very clearly written copy, and further it has been tampered with by some later sciolist who has, e.g., added dots to 37 of the I's. According to Mom. and Bormann it is a later hand which has cut the first three letters of fifeltares, under the $i$ of which are traces of an earlier $b$ or $r$; 'ita de emendatione (huius uerbi) desperavi,' Mommsen. For convenience and for comparison with similar dedications as $95,175,286,321$, I give in full the text as Mommsen would restore it, printing corrections in [ ], pure insertions in < > , complements to mere abbreviations in ().
L. Aienus L. f., D. Baebatius Sex. f. aedem dedicarunt Iouis liberi Furfone a. d. III. idus Quinctileis L. Pisone A. Gabinio cos., mense Flusare, comula teis olleis legibus, illeis regionibus, utei extrema $<f>$ unda[menta] <sunt> lapide facta hoiusque aedis ergo, uteique ad eam aede $<m>$ scalasque lapide st[r]uct<ae str $u>$ end $[a e]$ columnae stant citra scalas ad aedem uersus, stipitesque aedis hu[i]us tabulamentaque. Utei tangere sarcire tegere deuehere defigere mandare (?mund- with Orelli) ferro oeti promovere referre <liceat> fasque esto. Sei quod ad eam aedem donum datum donatum dedicatumque erit, utei liceat oeti uenum dare; ubei uenum datum erit, id profanum esto. Venditio locatio aedilis esto, quem quomque ueicus Furfens(is) fecerit, quod se senti[a]t eam rem sine scelere sine piaculo <uendere locare>, alis ne potesto. Quae pequnia recepta erit, ea pequnia emere conducere locare dare, quo id templum melius honestius seit, liceto. Quae pequnia ad eas res data erit, profana esto, quod d(olo). m(alo) non erit factum. Quod emptum erit aere aut argento ea pequnia, quae pequnia ad id [emend]um data erit, quod emptum erit, eis rebus eadem lex esto, quasei sei dedicatum sit. Sei qui heic sacrum surupverit, aedilis multatio esto, quanti uolet. Idque ueicus Furf(ensis) m[a]i(or) pars fifeltares sei absolwere uolent siue condemnare, liceto. Sei quei ad huc (Mom. would corr. hoc) templum rem deiuinam fecerit, Ioui libero aut Iouis genio, pelleis coria fanei sunto.

Note that dedicarunt in the first sentence governs aedem....stipitesque... tabulamentaque. The general meaning of the clauses in between is clear from parallel inscc. such as C. I. L. III, 1933: quandoque tibi hodie hane aram dabo dedicaboque, his legibus hisque regionibus dabo dedicaboque quas hic hodie palam dixero, uti infimum solum huius arae est; the uti clauses define the exact extent of the area dedicated, which in our insc. is limited by certain columnae structae struendae(ue). Quinctileis gives us the meaning of Flusare, and M. conjectures that comulateis is the name of some day in the month corresponding, I suppose, to $a$. $d$. III. idu's; it might also be corrupted from the parte. of some verb meaning 'to declare' 'publish.' It is a most unkind mischance that we cannot depend upon fifeltares. For further explanations see Mom. l.c., and Jordan Krit. Beitr. pp. 250-263.
(b) C. I. L. Ix. 3515, from the same neighbourhood, is pure Latin, but perhaps preserves the name of a local deity, if the text can be trusted. Here unhappily we have only a ms. record (see C. I. L.) of the first line, and the first two letters of the second : the remainder is in the Museum at Aquila. On the side of the stone was Sex Aro, according to one authority (Antinori).
dis ancitibu[s | .. usutranoru[ $m \mid$ Q. Pontius Seuerv[s |
p]ro salute sua et | Q. Ponti Nepotis | u. m. l. s.
These Di Ancites have been compared with the Angitiae at Sulmo (C.I. L. rx. 3074) and the Marsian goddess Angitia, see p. 289 f. inf.

Note xxix. C. I. L. rx. $4498=\mathrm{I}^{1} 1289$, an insc., now lost but attested by several ms. records and originally found at Cese near the site of Amiternum, shows, if the text be correct, a dialectic nom. sing. masc. in an otherwise Latin insc.
L. P. Modies C. f.
h. d. d. l. m.

250 Place-names ${ }^{1}$ of the Vestini ${ }^{2}$.
A. Well attested in form, date and locality.

Vestini ( $-\eta \sigma \tau$ - Strab. $-\epsilon \sigma \tau$ - Ptol.) cl. insce.
Peltuinum, -ini-,-inates Plin. inscc.
Furfo, -fenses inscc. S. M. di Furfona (Kiep.).

[^62]Ăvëia, -ates cl. inscc.
Aternus fl.cl. (Att-, insc. of Emperor Claudius). "A Avppos Polyb. 8.92.1. Atérno $f$.
Aternum opp. cl.
Tirinus fl. insce.
Pinna, -enses cl. inscc. (Plin. Penn-). Pénne.
Angulum (-yod-), -lani cl.
To these I would add from the upper Aternus valley (see sup. 248)
Amiternum, -nus, -ninus cl. inscc., rightly derived by Varro (L. L.
5. 28) from Aternus 1 I.

Foruli cl. insec.

## B. Less certain.

Aqua Ventina C. I. L. Ix. 3351.
Aufinates Plin. 3. 12. 107. Ofénc.
Fificulani C. I. L. ix. 3578.

## C. Doubtful.

Prifernum Tab. P., of. the cognomen Prifernas, and the nomen Prifernius in Sabine (311 C) and Aequian territory (276 C).
Frusteniae Tab. P.
Cingilia? Liv. 8. 29.
Cutina? ibid.
[B]usutrani ? C. I. L. Ix. $3515=$ Note xxviii $b$, sup. (Dis Ancitibus... usutranorum) ?Bussi.
Fisternae (near Foruli) Tab. P.
Te $\epsilon \tau \rho \circ \hat{v} \nu a$, a village near Amiternum, Dion. H. 2. 39. 2.
D. Further modern names.

Alánno, Beffi, Tussio, Fagnáno, Bazzáno, Ónna, Bominaco, Ópi, Capestráno, Ansidönia, Caláscio, Brítololi, Assérgi, Nocciảno, Tâvo f., Pescära, Lúcoli, Fơce, Scoppîto, Coppîto, Cése, Preturo, Cagnäno, Barete.

## 251 Personal Names ${ }^{1}$ of the Vestini ${ }^{2}$.

| A. Frequent. |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1. Nomina |  |
| gens Albia | Claudia | Octauidia |
| Apisia | Cornelia | Oppia l. inf. |
| Aponia | Flauia | Pomponia |
| Arria | Iulia | Proculeia |
| Attia | Laelia | Quintia (once -nct-) |
| Aufidia | Lollia | Rutilia |
| Bruttia | Lucia inf. | Septimia (-tum-) |
| Caesia | Nonia cf. inf. | Sextia |
| Caesiena | Nummia | Variasia |

2. Among the Cognomina may be mentioned

Rufus Saluius, praen. et cogn. (the latter mainly l.)
B. Less frequent.

1. Nomina.
```
gens Aelia
    Aemilia
    Aiena
    Aiopia (one insc.)
    Alenia
    Allidia
    Amiternia
    Aninia
    Annaea (-neia)
    Annaedia (once -ned-)
    Anniolena
    Appaea
```

Appuleia
Apronia
Atatina
Atria
Attiedia inf.
Auaea
Aueia
Aufidiena
Auidia
Auidiacca
Auincidia (one insc.)
Baebia

| Betulena |
| :--- |
| Betutia |
| Blaesia |
| Boelia |
| Caedia |
| Callia |
| Caluena |
| Caluia cf. inf. |
| Capria |
| Casnasia (one insc.) $l$. <br> Cassia |

${ }^{1}$ For the arrangement and notation see the List of Signs and Abbreviations.
${ }^{2}$ From C. I. L. Ix. 3336-3648, 4177-4533 etc., including the names from places round Amiternum in the upper Aternus valley, see p. 258 f.

| Catia | Maia inf. | Saluiena |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ceruia | Modia sup. | Saluolena |
| Cetria (one insc.) | Mucia | Seminiacca (oneinsc.) |
| Codicaria | Neria | Sentia $l$. |
| Cominia inf. | Nouelledia | Septimena (one insc.) |
| Considia | Obidia $l$. | , |
| Curia | Octauia cf. inf. | Sextilia |
| Curtilia | Opsturia | Staclena |
| Domitia | Orfia | Statia inf. |
| Ennia | Orfidia | Statidia $l$. |
| Estania | Ouiolena (one insc.) | Suellia $l$. |
| Fabia | Pal[f]uria (one insc.) | Summocrina |
| Fadia (one insc.) | Pappedia (one insc.) | Tebana (once Teib-) |
| Faesania | Pausculana (oneinsc.) | Tineia |
| Fannia | Petronia cf. inf. | Titia inf. |
| Feronia | Petrusulena $l$. | Trellena |
| Fuficia | Pompeia | Tullia |
| Fulcinia | Pompulledia | Valeria |
| Gauennia (one insc.) | Pompullia | Varena |
| Gauia | Pontia | Varia |
| Gauidia | Pontidia | $\frac{\text { Vassia }}{\text { Vedia (once Veid-) }}$ |
| Heluacia | Postumia | Vergilia |
| Heluia inf. | Quinctia | Vestinia |
| Herennia inf. | Raia | Vetia sup. (Vett-) |
| Hirnicia | Remmia $l$. | Vibia inf. |
| Hostilia | Rufria inf. | Vibulena |
| Lunia | Sallia | Vibullia 7. |
| Licinia | Saluidena $l$. | Vitulasia |
| Lucceia |  |  |

2. Among the Cognomina.

Ianuarius
Iulitta

Rufinus
Saturninus

Statius, praen. et cogn. Vrsus

|  | C. Once only. |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1. Nomina. |  |
| gens Accaua | Casinia | Octauellia |
| Aculena | Cloulia cf. inf. | Ofania |
| Acuria l. | Cocceia | Ofatulena |
| Afinia | Coelia | Ofdia |
| Aiadia Aiania $l$. | Coruia | Opsia inf. |
| Alfedia | Cosana? | Otteia |
| Alfena | Cosidia | Pagnia |
| Alfia | Cuspia | Papia l. inf. |
| Alliaris | Declial. | Peducaea |
| Alliaria | Decumedia | Pescennedia |
| Ancharia | Didia | Peticena |
| Annia | Erefria | Peticia |
| Anniena | Firmia | Peticienal. |
| Antistia | Fufia | Petiedia inf. |
| Apitia? | Fullonia | Pilia |
| Appaedia | Fuluia | Pollacaspe[na] $l$. |
| Appia | Furuia | Pompilia |
| Apponiolena | Gabinia | Pompulena |
| Arbaiana | Gallatronia | Poppedia $l$. |
| Arena | Heteria | Pulfennia |
| Asinia | Illyrica | Pummidia |
| Aufillia | Instacidia | Pupia |
| Auiedia 1. | Lainia | Quintilia |
| Aurelia | Lapscidia $l$. | Quirinia |
| Axeniz | Lesir | Raiania |
| Baia | Licinacia | Raulena $l$. |
| Barbatia $l$. | Lucretia |  |
| Billucidia $l$. | Lucullia $l$. | Risnacidia |
| Biolena | Manlia | Rubria |
| Bucleia | Marcia | Rufonia |
| Caelia | Maria | Sabidia cf. inf. |
| Caesiedia | Memmia | Saenia |
| Caetrania | Munatidia | Salia |
| Caetrania | Musedia l. cf. inf. | Saludeia |
| Calena | Naeuia | Saluidia |
| Camuria | Ninnia inf. | Sapiena $l$. |
| Canena $l$. | Nouia | Scaefia |
| Cania $l$. | Numisena | Scannia |
| Casidia | Numisia cf. inf. | Seiena |
| Casiena | $\overline{\text { Ocratia }}$ | Septimiena |


| Sergia $l$. |
| :--- |
| Sexo... |
| Siluana $l$. |
| Sinitia |
| Statoria |
| Suessana $l$. |
| Sulfia $l$. |
| Tadia |
| Tattia inf. |
| Tettia |
| Tettiana |

$\underline{\underline{~ N e t r i a n a ~}}$

Tettidia
Tettieidia
Teucidia
Titsiena
Tricaria
Varredinia $l$.
Vectiedia
Vemnasia
Veppial.
Vettidia
Vetulena $l$.

Veturia
Vibiedia $l$.
Vibiena $l$.
Vicrena
Vicria $l$.
Vinis
Vipsania
Vlpia
Vmbria
Vorena
Vsia $l$.
2. Among the Cognomina.

Ammia
Brocchus
Caesidia
Corinthus

Domna
Kaeso Restio

Rufilla
Suerra vir
Tarasuna

## IV. VOLSCIAN.

## A. Volsci.

252 Tabula Veliterna.

A tablet of bronze found at Velletri in 1784, now in the Museum at Naples, (where I saw it in April 1894), $1 \frac{3}{8}$ in. (•035 m.) high, $9 \frac{1}{\mathrm{~s}} \mathrm{in}$. ( $\cdot 231 \mathrm{~m}$.) long, letters $\frac{1}{4} \mathrm{in}$. high. The punctuation is Deecke's.
> deue declune statom. sepis atahus, pis uelestrom façia esaristrom se bim asif, uesclis uinu arpatitu. sepis toticu couehriu sepu, ferom pihom estu. ec $s 0$ cosuties ma ca tafanies medix sistiatiens.

The $a \beta$ is Latin with $\AA a,\langle c\rangle ¢,, \mathrm{D} d, \mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{F} f(g$ is perhaps wanting), $\vee l, M m, \cap$ and $\circlearrowleft o, \mathrm{P} p, \mathrm{R} r, S s$, 个 $t$. Thus it is almost identical in character with that of the bronze of Rapino (243). The words are separated by : which is replaced by $\vdots$ after statom (1. 1) and toticu (1. 3). There is a single punct at the foot of the line at the end of $11.2,3,4$, but not of 1. 1. Bücheler would punctuate at esaristrom (l. 2), Mommsen at se, Bréal at asif.

All our authorities call Velitrae originally a Volscian town, but Livy (2. 30-31) and Dionysius Halic. (6.42-3) state that it became a colony in 494 B.c., having been taken from the Volscians. How far this statement is to be accepted, and in whose hands the town lay at various times in the fifth century B.c. are matters of dispute (see Mommsen C. I. L. x. p. 651 and Beloch It. Bund p. 177), but for our purpose it is enough that early in the following century Velitrae was fighting with the

Volscians against Rome (Diod. 14. 102, 389 B.C., Liv. 6.12 ff., 385 в.c.) and was continually hostile to Rome down to and in the Latin War (Liv. 6 passim, $7.15,8.4$ etc.), though it is spoken of always rather as an ally than as a member of the Latin League : hence at this time it seems probable that Volscian influence was stronger than Latin. At all events in 338 b.c. (Liv. 8.14) though the local senators were expatriated and the town stripped of its walls, the community persisted in some shape, which must have been that of a civitas sine suffragio (Mom. l.c., Beloch It. Bund p. 49). If, as both Mommsen and Beloch assume, the insc. belongs to this period, the mention of the medix shows that the town had some rights of self-government, i.e. that it belonged to the Caerite, not the aerarian class of these municipia. This franchise was converted into full Roman citizenship some time before 230 B.C., when the Velitrian gens of the Octavii (Suet. Aug. 6) first appear in the Roman fasti (Bel. p. 123); and, since this was never granted (ib. p. 121 f.) save to Latin-speaking towns, it follows that, say, 240 B.c. is a safe lower limit of date for this insc., which accords very well with what we know of the spread of Latin in other parts of the Volscian district. The coins of Aquinum between 268-217 b.c. (Head p. 23) have the legend aquino, which is probably Latin, whether it be a gen. plur. (since Ital. ō in Velitrae seems to be represented by Volsc. u), or an acc. sing. (since in any case it has lost an $-m$, which in the Velitrae insc. appears consistently written). Fundi, Formiae and Arpinum received full Roman citizenship in 188 в.с. (Liv. 38. 36) and Privernum some time before Lucilius (fragm. inc. virl. 25 Müll.). As early as 225 B.c. the Volscians were no longer recognised as separate from the Latins, since they do not appear in Polybius' list (2. 24) of Italian tribes able to furnish troops.

For an upper limit of date, in the uncertainties of the history of the town, the resemblance of the $a \beta$ in all but the signs for $e$ and $f$ to that of the bronze of Rapino (243 sup., 260-250 B.c.) points to the first half of the third century, since the cursive \| and \| seem less primitive than $F$ and $F$. Little stress can be laid on the use of $c$ (not $g$ ) in the abbreviation (1. 4) for the praenomen (contrasted with asignas in 243), but I do not think we shall be far wrong in dating this insc. about 300 B.C.

Büch. Lex. Ital. passim. U.D. pp. 320, 324. Deecke Rh. M. Xli. (1886) p. 200. Bréal Rev. Archéol. xxxif. (1876, 2nd Vol.) p. 241. Zv. It. Med. 46, Tab. x. 4, F. 2736.

253 Found on the site of the ancient Antinum, and first published (not in facsim.) by Romanelli, Antica Topografia del regno di Napoli iii. p. 231; facsim. by Garrucci Bull. Arch. Nap. n. ser. i. tav. iii. 1, whence Zvet. It. Med. vi. 9, and the text. The original belonged to the Ferrante family but appears now to be lost.

## pa ui | pacuies medis | uesune dunom ded $\mid$ ea cumnios cetur

On a small bronze plate $\cdot 175 \mathrm{~m}$. long by 044 high ( 7 in . by $1 \frac{1}{2}$ ) with a hole in the middle of each side for nailing; in Lat. a $\beta$ with $\lambda, C, D, E$, $M, O, \Gamma, R, S, T, V$ and $V$, and therefore far younger than that of the preceding insc., though probably not later than 150 b.c.

The following passage of Livy (4.57, 408 B.C.) has been generally referred to Antinum. Caesi ad Antium hostes; uictor exercitus depopulatus Volscum agrum; castellum ad lacum Fucinum ui expugnatum atque in eo tria milia hominum capta, ceteris Volscis intra moenia compulsis nec defendentibus agros. Its situation at the head of the valley of the Liris would seem to connect it rather with Sora than with the Marsians, who lived on the other side of the wall of hills that bounds L. Fucinus on the South, though as the crow flies Antinum was only some five miles S.W. of the lake. Hence Mommsen was disposed to regard this insc. as Volscian, especially in view of the parallel arrangement of the names in this and the tabula Veliterna; and seeing that in vocalism (dūnom) it agrees precisely with the tabula (deue declune, dat. sing. fem., estu 'esto') and differs from the insc. of Luco ( 267 inf ., with Casō nom. sing. masc., Casontoniōm gen. pl., $d \bar{o}[n]$ om acc. sing., Actia dat. sing. fem.) it seems necessary to separate it from the Marsian inscc. Whether the dialect spoken in Antinum agreed in all particulars (e.g. in its treatment of the velars and of $c$ before $i$ ) with that of Velitrae is another question. Antinum itself was counted Marsian in classical times, being called Marsi Antinum in C. I. L. IX. 3839, and its inhabitants Antinates Marsi ibid. 3845, and Mommsen (ibid. p. 362) is clearly right in supposing that in Pliny (3. § 106) Atinates is an error for Ant-; Marsorum Anxatini, Atinates Fucentes, Lucenses, Marruuini, a passage which appears to be the only mention of the town in any classical author.
U. D. p. 321, Fabr. 2740, Zvet. I. M. 41.

Note Xxx. Inscription found near Tarracina.
Formerly in the possession of Saulini, a Roman dealer, who received it from the neighbourhood of Tarracina; now lost sight of. Brunn, Bull. Inst. Arch. Rom. 1864, p. 37, and Willmanns Ephem. Epigr. 1. p. 32.
statis cloil c
Lat. $\alpha \beta$, on an ivory die with single interpunct; Willmanns deemed it Oscan, and the diphthong (?) oi and the position of the father's praenomen
after the nomen of the son seem to separate this insc. from the preceding; but in our scant knowledge of the dialect or dialects spoken in Volscian territory, it is safer not to depart from the geographical order. If it comes from Tarracina itself, it must be counted either Latin (with $f$ omitted-for want of room?) or else as having belonged to a Campanian settled in the town-since Tarracina became a Roman colony in 329 b.c., Liv. 8. 21. The second word is of course an abbreviation; Willmanns prints it CLÓIL, without explaining why the accent does not appear in Brunn's text. It cannot be an apex to denote length, since that first appears on inscc. of Augustan times.

Zvet. Osc. 31.

## 254 Volscian Gloss.

Fest. 293 M . (whose restorations are printed here in italics).
Sublicium pontem quidam putant appellatum esse a sublicis, peculiari uocabulo Volscorum, quo appellant tigna in latitudinem extensa unde pontem non aliter Formiani uocant.......librorum: quae ab aliis auctoribus sublices uocantur. Quidam quod sub eo aqua liquens laberetur, sublicium dicunt. Sublices (-ges cod.) appears also in Gloss. Lat.-Gr. Goetz, 2. p. 190
 form used by Latin writers, e.g. Caes. B. G. 4. 17.

255 Glosses assigned to the 'Rustici', with ō for au and ē for $\mathrm{ae}^{1}$.
i. With ofor au. orum, orata, oricula.

Fest. 182 M. Orata genus piscis, appellata a colore auri, quod rustici orum dicebant, ut auriculas, oriculas. Itaque Sergium quoque quendam praediuitem quod et duobus anulis aureis et grandibus uteretur, Oratam [Cic. Fin. 2 § 70] dicunt esse appellatum. So Paul. ad loc.
${ }^{1}$ Were these Rustici Volscians, or under Volscian influence? See Conway, Idg. Forsch. Iv. p. 215, as against Thurneysen, Kuhn's Z. 28. 154 who treats many of the examples differently. Low Latin seems in some cases to have taken the Classical, in others the Rustic form; see Meyer-Lübke, $\S \S 27$ and 281 ff., who, however, follows Thurneysen.

The following non-Classical forms occur in writers on husbandry. cöda Varro e.g. R. R. 2. 5. 8.
cödex 'bark' Colum, e.g. 4. 8. 2.
cōles e.g. Varro R. R.1.31. 2 [and often in Mss. e.g. of Hor. and Prop.
J. P. P.].
hōstus e.g. Cato R. R.5. 2.
$\overline{\text { origa }}$ Varro e.g. R. R. 2, 7. 8.
pösea e.g. id. ib. 1. 24. 1.
plōstrum e.g. id. ib. 1. 22. 3 (this was the form used by Vespasian, Suet. Vesp. 22).

The following are no doubt of similar origin:
$\bar{O} l u s$ for Aulus, fairly frequent on inscc., e.g. C. I. L. vi. 13940, 18777, v. 391, 6445, Ix. 3212. Similarly

Pölla for Paulla inscc. Cf. the Index to the Cognomina of the Dialectareas.
$\overline{\text { ospicor }}{ }^{1}$ Claud. Quadrig. ap. Diom. 383.10 K .
Clōdia gens, first so called in Rome by Pub. Clodius Pulcher.
Lōretum in Auentino Plin. 15. 138, Fasti Vallenses (C. I. L. I ${ }^{1}$ p. 320) Aug. 13.
cōpo, cōpona, inscc., e.g. C. I. L. IX. 2689 from Aesernia. Charis. Keil 1. 63 , if the text be sound, in discussing the gender of nouns in $-\bar{o}$, $-\bar{o} n i s$, cites the form cupo, comparing Cupa as the title of the Vergilian poem generally called Copa, with no comment on the first syllable.

Cōrus for Caurus. [Often in texts. J. P. P.]
Serv. ad Georg. 3. 278. Chaurum pro Chorum, sicut saurex pro sorex, caulis pro colis.
lōtus, elōtus, illōtus, beside lautus, elautus (Plaut. Rud. 3. 3. 37), illautus (Plaut. Poen. 1. 2. 23) and ablūtus, collūtus, elūtus, illūtus (Cato R. R. 147), cf. Idg. Forsch. l.c.
oricilla Mss. of Catull. 25. 2 [J. P. P.].
rōdus 'res rudis.'
Fest. 265 M. Rodus uel raudus significat rem rudem et inperfectam. Nam saxum quoque raudus appellant poetae, ut Accius in Melanippo: 'Constituit $\dagger^{2}$ cognouit sensit conlocat sese in locum Celsum ; hine manibus rapere roudust saxeum grandem et grauemt.' Et in Chrysippo [the lines are very corrupt]. Volgus quidem in usu habuit non modo pro aere imperfecto, ut Lucilius cum ait: 'Plumbi paxillum, rodust linique matexam + ,' sed etiam $<$ pro> signato, quia in mancipando, cum dicitur, 'Rudusculo libram ferito,' asse tangitur libra. Cincius de uerbis priscis sic ait: 'Quemadmodum omnis

[^63]fere materia non deformata rudis appellatur, sic aes infectum rudus cuium $\dagger$. Apud aedem Apollinis aes tconflatum iacuit, id adrudus appellabant. In aestimatione censoria aes infectum rudist appellatur.' Rudiari ab eodem dicuntur qui saga noua poliunt. Hominem imperitum rudem dicimus.

Cf. Paul. ad loc. Rudus uel raudus cum dicitur, res rudis et imperfecta significatur. Hominem quoque imperitum rudem uocamus. Also Paul. 275 M. Rodusculana porta appellata, quod rudis et impolita sit relicta, vel quia raudo id est aere, fuerit uincta.

Semiplōtia, contrasted with pure Lat. Plautus, Plautius, and plautus ' flat,' see s.v. plötus inf. 368 A.

Remark 1. With these words must be considered the following Latin forms which are written always, or most frequently in good authors, with $\ddot{0}$, although au appears to be the original sound.

## cōdicillus

föcale, -fōcare (suf-, less frequently of-, prae-)
-plōdere (ex-, less frequently com-, dis-) contrasted with the pure Latin re-formate applaudo, and with words showing the true phonetic change in compounds like conclüdo.
sōrex v. sup. s.v. Cōrus.

## Finally

cōs, cōtis 'whetstone,' if we take it to be identical with cautes'. This could not be right if the difference between the two were simply phonetic; but, on the other hand, if cōs be originally Rustic, then it must be observed that it shows just such a specialisation of meaning as may be looked for in a borrowed word । cf. 205 sup. Rem. 7 p. 226.
? olla $=$ aula, see von Planta Osk.-Umb. Gram. p. 155, and Idg. Forsch. l.c.

Remark 2. A few words in Latin show a labial in place of an original velar, and the majority of scholars incline to regard them as borrowed from Oscan. From geographical considerations I think Volscian is a more likely source. I have no doubt that the change is to be seen in popa, popina, palumbes; bos ${ }^{2}$, bubulcus, buculus, Subura old Lat. Sug- (cf. Note xxxvii. 6 inf.); but on the last three words (as well as lupus which does not belong here), see Darbishire Trans. Camb. Philol. Soc. iii. p. 187 (=Relliquiae Philologicae p. 90). Of older references the most useful are von Planta Osk.-Umb. Gram. pp. 331, 333, 335, Bersu, Die Gutturalen u. ihre Verb. im Lat. pp. 136 ff. Poena, punire are generally derived ${ }^{3}$ from $\pi \circ เ \nu \eta$ '.
${ }^{1}$ [Also spelt cotes, but cautes in the sense of 'whetstones' is rare. J. P.P.]
${ }^{2}$ Objections have been raised to the 'borrowing' of the name for such a common animal; but by this expression no more is meant than that the country form bos gradually ousted from use the town form ( ${ }^{*} u 0 s$ ).
${ }^{3}$ The oe of the noun may in any case, I think, be explained by the use of the word as a technical term in legal documents, so that its written form prevailed over the spoken; foedus 'treaty' is a parallel case.

## ii. With ē for ae?

Mesius $=$ Muesius.
Varro L. L. 7. 96. In pluribus uerbis $a$ ante $e$ alii ponunt, alii non, ut quod partim dicunt scaeptrum, partim sceptrum, alii Plauti Faeneratricem, alii Feneratricem, sic Faenisicia ac Fenisicia, ac rustici pappum Mesium non Maesium. So edus for haedus id. ib. 97, though ef. 309 inf. s.v. fedo-.

The other exfmples can hardly belong here, see Idg. Forsch. Iv. p. 215 n., and now also Lindsay Lat. Language, p. 44, where the later history of Lat. ae is traced.

Remark 3. On the strength of Volsc. arpatitu ( 252 sup.) the form ar for ad in Latin forms like arbiter, arcesso, arfuise (C. I. L. $\mathbf{1}^{1196}$ ), arfari, arfines and arger (Prisc. 1.45), arsedentes (Placid. 8), artemo (Placid. 4), aruena, arueniet, aruocitat (Placid. 8), aruolat (Prisc. 1.c.), aruorsum (C. I. L. I¹ 198 al.), has been explained as a borrowing from Volscian. But it is inconceivable that the Romans should have used the Volscian form of words like arfuisse, aruorsum. For other conjectures see von Planta, Osk..Umb. Gram. p. 408, and compare Mars. apur finem 267 inf. and p. 222 Rem. 1.

## 256 Place-names ${ }^{1}$ of the Volscian ${ }^{2}$ district.

## A. Well attested in form, date and locality.

Volsci cl. inscc. ('Oגбоí Scylax 9, elsewhere Ơ̇o入oûбкоє more frequent than Oúódбкoı). Kiepert Alte Geogr. p. 437 compares 'Eגíavkou, the name of a Ligurian tribe in a marshy district on the Ligurian coast.
Formĭae, -ianus cl. inscc., older Hormiae cl. e.g. Stra. 5. 3. 6, connected by tradition e.g. Plin. 3 § 69 with the $\Lambda a \omega \sigma \tau \rho \dot{y} \gamma \boldsymbol{\text { ves. }}$. Keller's explanation (Volksetym. p. 16) of the doublet is to me doubtful; the present name Formia has been only recently adopted in lieu of Mola di Gaéta.
Cāiēta, -tanus. cl. Guétu.
Ămyclae or -unclae cl. (Amunclae is the form preferred by Sillig ad Plin. 8. 29. 104).
${ }^{1}$ For the arrangement and notation see the List of Signs and Abbreviations.
${ }_{2}$ The Itinerary-routes through Volscian territory (Viac Appia et Latina) are given C. I. I. x. p. 58 fi.

For the vicissitudes of the district in the V. and IV. centuries в.c., see the references given above 252 n 。

Caecŭbum, -bus cl.
Statanum (uinum) cl.
Fundi, -danus cl. inscc. Fóndi.
Amăsēnus fl. Verg. Aen. 7.685 al. Amaseno f.
Fērōnĭae lucus cl. Ferónia.
Tarracina, -acinenses, -icinenses cl. inscc.; later altered by popular etymology to Terr- (Stra. 5. 3. 6 derives from rpaxıvi, Ovid Metam. 15. 717 calls it Trächas; Kiepert Alt. Geogr. p. 437 compares Tarquinius, Tarchon, and conjectures an Etruscan settlement). Terracina. Its older name was
Anxur ("A $\nu \xi \omega \rho$ Diod. Sic. 14. 16. 5), masc. Martial ter, neut. Hor. Sat. 1. 5. 26 , cl. -urates 'Volscorum lingua' Paul. Fest. 22 M., Anxurnas adj. Liv. 27. 38; Verg. Aen. 10.544 (using the word for a personal name) makes gen. Anxưris.
Circeius M., Circēii opp., -ceienses, cl. inscc.
$\bar{U} f e n s$ fl. masc. cl. Ouf- esp. in tribus Oufentina cl. inscc. (Alumen Aufentum? Plin. 3. 59, cf. Aufentinus a doubtful cogn. C. I. L. ix. 1199). Uffente f.

Ŭlŭbrae cl. (first Cic. ad Fam. 7. 18) insc., -anus insce., -ensis Pl. 3. 9. 64.
Norba cl. Cf. however Momm. C. I. L. x. p. 642. Nôrma.
Signia, -ninus cl. inscc. (Seic- nmm.), but cf. Momm. ib. p. 591. Segni.
Cŏra, -ani cl. insc. but cf. Momm. ib. p. 645. Córi.
Vělītrae, -īternus cl. inscc. see 252 supr. and Momm. l.c. p. 651. Vellétri.
Clostra Romae, or Romanan. pl. cl.
Interamna cl., -amnates (Lirenates) cl. inscc. (Lirenas Sucasina Pl. 3. 5. 64), -ápulov Str. 5. 3. 9. Pignataro Interamna (or Termine? Kiep.).
Liris m. fl. (Acipts) cl. inscc. Cf. Clanis C inf. Liri (its upper half, then) Gurigliano $f$.
Căsinum, -inates cl. inscc. Cassino.
Ăquīnum, -nas cl. inscc. Aquíno.
Ātina, -nas cl. inscc. Atína.
Arcae An. Rav. 4. 43, praedium - canum Cic. Árce.

Frĕgellae, -anus cl. Later only the village Fregellanum Itiun.; in 124 b.c. the town was destroyed and succeeded by
Făbrātĕria (Noua) cl., -terni (Nouaui) cl. inscc. Cf. Mom. C. I. L. x. p. 547. Falvatera.

Făbrātĕría Vetus, -erni Veteres cl. inscc. (cf. C. I. L. x. p. 552).

Arpīnum, -nas cl. (nom. sing. -natis Cato ap. Prisc. q.v. vol. 2, p. 129 Keil). Immisch, Leipz. Stud. 8, p. 322, derives this with the Daunian Arpi from the root of Lat. arcus (arq-) as being situated, like Thess. Гovyoi, on curving rivers.
Fībrēnus fl. Cic. Leg. 2. 1-3, Sil. 8. 399. Fibréno f.
Sora £́́pa, -anus cl. inscc. Sórou.
Cereatae (Marianae), -atini (Mariani), (Kıppaı̂âaı Plut.) cl. inscc. Casamári.
Frŭš̌nō masc. (fem.? Lib. Col. x. p. 232 Lachm.), -ǐnates cl. insc. Frosinóne.
Prīvernum, -nates cl. inscc., Preiv-, Prev-, Priv- nmm. C. I. L. $\mathrm{r}^{1} .466,467$ (58 в. ..). Pipérno.
[Forum Appii C. I. L. x. 6824, Cic. Att. 2. 10 all.].
Paludes Pomptinae cl., Pont-later; tribus Pomptina cl. inscc. (also called Saturae palus Verg. Aen. 7. 801 al.); cf.
Suessa Pōme(n)tia, -anus Pome(n)tinus cl. e.g. Liv. 1. 53 (-mĕt- Verg. Aen. 6. 776, - $\mu$ evr- Plut., Diod. Sic., Strab., and in inscc. Pomentinus as a nomen C. I. L. iII. 1728 and 622, cognomen ibid. 4186; cf. Festus s.v. Pomptina).
\{ Astura fl. et opp. cl. (Stura Fest. s.v. Mill. p. 316-7). Astura f.
Decennouium C. I. L. x. 6850.
Sētĭa, -tinus ( $\sum \eta \tau-$ rarely $\Sigma \in \tau-$ ). cl. inscc. Sézze.
Tripontium C. I. L. x. 6824, 6850. Tórre Trepóntí (K.).
Satricum, -cani cl. e.g. Liv. 6. 33. Cf. Mom. C. I. L. x. p. 661. (Earpía Plut. Cam. 37. 6.)
Longula, -lanus cl. e.g. Liv. 9. 39; -lanus as cogu. insce.
Corioli, -lanus Kopıo- cl. e.g. Liv. 2. 33.
Antyum, -tias, -tiatinus, cl. inscc. (-tius poet.). Cf. Momm. C. I. L. x. p. 660. Porto d'Ánzio.
[Tres Tabernae cl.]
Apiolae, -lani cl. e.g. Liv. 1. 35.

Ecetra, -trani Liv. (e.g. 6. 31) 'EX'́- Dion. Hal. Kiepert, Alt. Geog. p. 437, compares the Sicilian 'EХ'́ $\boldsymbol{\tau} \boldsymbol{\lambda} a$.

Verrugo -ginis fem. ("Eppovka Diod. Sic. 14. 11) cl. e.g. Liv. 4.55.
Pontiae Insulae, -iani cl. Oenotrides insulae Strab. 6. 1. 1 al. i.e. Pontia cl. (Liv. 9. 28, 7 assigns it to the Volsci and calls the single island Pontiae, as Plin. and Varro, no doubt because of one or two closely adjacent islets which had no separate names.) Pònza.
Palmaria cl. Palmaróla.

## B. Less certain.

Antinum, see note to 253 sup.
Lautulae Liv. 7. 39 al.
T $\rho \hat{\eta} \rho$ os f. Stra. 5. 3. 9. Tolēro f. (K.).
Heluīna Ceres Juv. 3. 318, v. Mom. C. I. L. x. 5382.
Kó $\sigma a \varsigma$ fl. Stra. 5. 3. 9, Aelian Var. Hist. 2. 26, 4. 17. Cósaf.
*Luca, -cani Liv. 8. 19 'Fabraterni et Lucani ex Volscis' (8. 25.3 proves that these are not the people of Lucania). With this must, I think, be connected (as by Momm. U. D. p. 170) the ager Lucanus of C. I. L. x. 3917, though there ${ }^{1}$ M. calls the insc. 'origine Calenam.'
Cominium Liv. 10. 39-44, Dion. Hal. 17 [18]. 4-5 (16. 16-7), cf. Samnite Place-names 187 B.
Sinonia insula Plin. 3. 5. 81 al. Zannone.
Nymphaeus $\ddagger$. Plin. 3.5.57. Ninfa opp.
Castrum Innŭi Verg. Aen. 6. 776, and Serv. ad loc. Castrum Ovid Met. 15. 727 al., -ranu s Mart. 4. 60.

## C. Doubtful.

Clanis or Glanis, older name of the Liris (supr. A), Stra. 5. 3. 6. Cf. Plin. 3. 59.
*Melfis? Mulfe It. An. Rav. 4. 33, Melfel Tab. P., Mé $\lambda \pi \iota \varsigma$ f. Stra. 5. 3. 9.
Scatebrafl. Plin. 2 § 227.
Artena? Liv. 4. 61.
Ceno Liv. 2. 63.
[Ad Sponsas It. Hieros. p. 611].
[Ad Turres Albas Tab. P. It. Rav. 4. 32, 5. 2].
${ }^{1}$ I have disregarded an obvious misprint.

## D. Further modern names.

Coreno Ausonia, Ítri, Pico, Lenola, Sonnino, Caposéte, Maenza, S. Giov. in Cárico, Quosa f. (K.), Capo di Chia (K.), Cerváro, Mollarino f. (K.), Opi, Brocco, Alvîto, Vicalvi, Frajoli (K.), Cepráno, Bauco, Ceccáno, Fumone, Carpinéto, Sacco (=Tolero) f., Gorga, Conca, Lugnano.

257 Personal names ${ }^{1}$ of the Volsci ${ }^{2}$.

|  | A. Frequent. |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1. Nomina. |  |
| gens Acilia | Clodia | Lucretia |
| Aelia | Cocceia | Mamia (-aam-) |
| Aemilia | Cornelia ( $g, l$ ) | Mamilia (once -illia) |
| Albia | Decumia | Manlia |
| Alfia | Dentria | Manneia |
| Annia | Domitia | Marcia |
| Antonia | Egnatia inf. | Maria |
| Arria | Fabia | Memmia |
| Asinia | Flauia passim | Messia |
| Atilia (once Attil-) | Fufidia | Meuia |
| Aufidia | Furia | Minucia (once -nic-) |
| Auidia | Futia (once Fuut-) | Munatia |
| Auillia (twice -ilia) | Gauia | Naeuia |
| Aurelia (twice -ellia) | Geminia | Nunnia |
| Aurelia (twice -ella) | Helvia inf. | Octauia cf. inf. |
| Bruttia (once Bri-) | Herennia | Ofillia (one insc. |
| Caecilia | Iulia passim | -ilia) |
| Caecina (once -inia) | Innia | Oppia inf. |
|  | Laelia | Paccia inf. |
| Caesia | Larcia | Papia |
| Caluia inf. | Licinia | Petronia |
| Capria | Luccia | Pompeia |
| Claudia | Lucia inf. |  |

${ }^{1}$ For the arrangement and notation see the List of Signs and Abbreviations.
${ }^{2}$ From C. I. L. x. $5044-5794,5960-6762,6773-6785,8050,8238-8242$, 8259-8305, 8382-8387, 8395-8418, etc., and from Kaibel I. G. It. Sic. 903-912.

| Pomponia | Sulpicia | Veturia |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Postumia | Tatia | Veueia (Veb- ontiles) |
| Publilia (Pop-) | Terentia ( $g, l$ ) |  |
| Quinctia (-int-, once | Tillia | Vibia (once Veib-) |
| -einct-) | Titia (Tittia) |  |
| Quinctilia | Trebellia | Vibullia |
| Roscia | Trebia inf. ? | Vicria |
| Rutilia | Tullia | Vitruuia |
| Satria | Valeria | Vlpia |
| Septimia (-tum-) | Verria | Vmmidia(twiceVmi-) |
| Sextilia | Verria | Volumnia |
| Staedia (as often | Vettia |  |
| Staid-) inf. |  |  |
| 2. Among the Cognomina may be mentioned |  |  |
| Bassus | Pollio | Saluius inf. |
| Ianuarius | Proculus | Saturnina -us |
| Polla | Rufus | Statius inf. |

## B. Less frequent.

1. Nomina.
gens Abuccia $l$.
Abuttia
Acerronia
Acricedia
Aebutia
Aecilia
Aestlania
Aetrilia
Afiedia
Afinia
Agileia
Agria
Aiedia
Alfidia
Allia
Ammia $l$.
Anicia?
Animisia
Aninia inf.
Annaea
Antistia (-est-)

| Apidia | Braccia |
| :--- | :--- |
| Aponia | Burbuleia <br> Appia |
| Caedicia |  |
| Appuleia (Apu-) | Caelia |
| Apronia | Caerellia |
| Aquilia (Aquill-) | Caesonia |
| Arellia | Caia |
| Atauia | Calidia |
| Atinia inf. | Calpurnia |
| Attia | Caluisia |
| Auiania | Camidia |
| Aulia | Canuleia |
| Aurunculeia (once | Carbetania |
| -cleia) | Careia |
| Babulia | Carrinas |
| Badia | Casinia |
| Balonia | Cassia |
| Barronia | Castricia inf. |
| Bennia | Cauaria |
| Betutia inf. | Ceia |
| Bircia |  |
| Blaia $l$. | Cisuitia |


| Coelia | Lucceia | Plancia |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Comicia | Lucilia | Plania |
| Cominia inf. | Lusia | Pollia |
| Cosconia | Maenia (Men-) | Pontia inf. |
| Cossutia (once Cosu-) | Magia | Popidia inf. |
| Crittia | Magneia | Popillia |
| Cupania | Maia inf. | Poppaea |
| Cupiennia | Maiania | Porcia |
| Curtia | Manilia | Praecilia |
| Curtonia | Maticia | Procilia |
| Decia inf. | Matiena | Prosia |
| Dotia | Mestria | Prusinia |
| Durmia | Metein | Publicia (once Pob-) |
| Epidia inf. | Mettia | Racilia one insc. |
| Epria | Minatia inf. | Rasinia |
| Fauonia | Minculeia one insc. |  |
| Faustia | Minia l. inf. | Refria |
| Fidia | Mollia | Rennia |
| Firminia | Mummia (once Mum-) | Rabbia $l$. |
| Floria | Munnia (once Mun-) | Rubria |
| Fonteia | Murcia | Ruelia |
| Fuficia | Mussia | Rufreia one insc. |
| Fuluia |  | Runtia |
| Fundania | Nouia inf. | Rustia |
| Galeria | Numisia inf. | Sabidia cf. inf. |
| Gargilia |  | Saenia |
| Gauenia | Numitoria | Saleiuia (once Saliu-) |
| Gellia | Nummia | Salonia |
| Gennia | Obinia | Saluia |
| Gentia | Obultronia | Sarronia |
| Grania | Ofellia | Saufeia inf.? |
| Heleia | Ofia inf. | Sauonia |
| Heria | Opetreia | S[c]atiena |
| Hordeonia | Orbia | Scribonia |
| Hortoria | Otacilia | Scutia |
| Laberia | Ouia | Seia |
| Lacia | Ouinia | Sempronia |
| Lacutulana | Pacuuia (once Pacria) | Sentia |
| Lania | $i n f$. | Septueia (one insc.) |
| Largia $l$. one insc. | Pantuleia | Sergia |
| Latinia | Papinia | Seruia |
| Laufeia | Papiria | Seruilia |
| Lepidia | Pescennia | Sestia |
| Liuia | Petrusidia | Sextia |
| Lollia | Pettia | Silia inf. |
| Longana | Picidia | Sittia |
| Longidia | Pineial, | Sorana |

Spedia, inf.
Spelia (once Spell-)
Staia (one insc. Sta-
hia) inf.
Statia inf.
Statilia
Stenia inf.
Stertinia
Suetria
Suillia
Tampia
Tarquinia
Tarquitia
Tedia l, (once Tid-)
Teriuia $l$.

Tettia inf
Timinia
Titedia
Tuccia
Turpilia
Turrania
Tutia (once Tout-)
Tutilia
Valgia
Varia ( $g, l$ ) inf.
Varronia
Vedia
Veratia
Vergilia
Vertuleia

Villia
Vinia (Vinnia)
Vinicia inf.
Vipstana
Viria inf.
Vitellia
Vitteia?
Vitullia (once, and once -ulia)
Voconia (once Vocc-)
Voluntilia
Volusia
Vtilia
2. Among the Cognomina.

| Alipiana | Daphnus <br> Ammia <br> l. | Farro |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |$\quad$| Posilla |
| :--- |
| Apella |

C. Once only.

1. Nomina.
gensAbidia (g)
Accia
Aefria
Aetreia
Aigia
Albania
Albinia
Alleia inf.
Allidia
Alpinia?
Ambiuia
Amelia
Ampia
Ampudia
Ancharia

Anchariena?
Anniolena
Antias
Appellasia
Aprucia
Apsennia
Apstidia
Aquinia
Arabia
Aradia
Aristia
Artoria
Aternia
Atria
Autronia

Baionia
Betiliena
Betuedia
Blossia inf.
Braetia
Bullania
Butronia
Caemia
Caiatia
Calauia l. inf.
Caluentia
Candilia
Caninia $l$.
Casticia

| Catiena 7. | Galgestes | Nellia |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Catinia | Gauidia | Neria |
| Caucideia | Gegania | Norbana |
| Cemoleia | Graia | Numistronia |
| Cerrinia | Graicia | Ocratia |
| Ceruaria | Grattia | Ofasia |
| Ceruial. <br> Cincia | Groesia | Ogulnia |
| Cloelia sup. | Gustilia $l$. | Oraria $l$. |
| Codennia | Histumennia | Orcilia |
| Codennia | Insteia | Ostiensis |
| Cofia $l^{\text {l }}$ | Istiminial. | Pacidia $l$. |
| Cordia | Iustuleia | Pacuria |
| Cornificia | Iuuentia | Passiena |
| Cossinia | Laeuia | Patulcia |
| Crassicia | Laterina | Peilia |
| Crepereia | Lepania | Pellia |
| Critonia | Ligaria | Percennia l., inf |
| Crustidia | Literria | Perperna |
| Curiatia | Longu[leia] | Petilia |
| Cuspia | Lotria | Pettid[ia] |
| Cutia | Lucernia | Piscinnia |
| (Decriana) | Luscidia | Plaria |
| Digitia | Lutatia | Plauial. |
| Dignial. | Luttia | Plotulena 2. |
| Domatia | Macrinia | Plutia |
| Duilia $l$. | Magullia | Pontuleia |
| Edia |  | Precia |
| Eggia | Magulnia inf. | Priuernia |
| Ennia | Maiana | Propertia |
| Eppania ${ }^{\text {d }}$ | Mammuleia $l$. | Pullia |
| Erucia | Marria | Purpurnia |
| Eteria | Marulcia | Quintinia |
| Faberia | Masonia | Rabonia? |
| Fabraterna | Masonia | Raecia |
| Faracia | Matria | Roesia $l$. |
| Feridia | Menturnia ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | Rubrena |
| Ferronia | Metilia | Rufelleia |
| Fertoria | Modia Mollicia | Rufrania |
| Fidiclania? | Mummeia | Rullia |
| Firmia | Mundicia | Safinia |
| Flaminia | Murria 7. | Safronial. |
| Fobia | Nasennia | Sallustia |
| Fresidia | Nasernia | Samiaria 7. |
| Fufia | Nauia | [S]atriena |
| Fundia | Nautia $l$. | Sattia |


| Saturia | Tadia | Vennonia l. |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Scirtia | Tallentia | Verania |
| Scomedia $l$. | Tanonia | Verulana |
| Segia | Tarcia | Viaria $l$. |
| Seppia $l$. | Terrinia | Vibronia |
| Sepania | Thorania | Viscaria |
| Seria | Thoria | Visellia |
| Sestullia l. | Tintoria | Visullia |
| Setina | Titinia | Vmbilia $l$. |
| Sosia | Tossia | Volcacia |
| Sotinia | Trauia | Voltilia $l$. |
| Spultia $l$. | Tridonia | Voluscia $l$. |
| Staldia | Truttidia | Voluseia |
| Stellia | Turuena | Vrsia |
| Sueia | Vargunteia | Vsia |
| Suestidia | Veia | Vttedia |
| Suetonia | Venafrania |  |
| Suettia | Venelia |  |

2. Among the Cognomina.


## B. Aurunci.

The Ausones, called Aurunci by the Romans, must in early times have inhabited a wider district than the strip of territory on either side of Mons Massicus between the Volturnus and the Liris, to which we find them confined in historical times. By Greek writers the name Ausonia was applied to Latium and Campania (cf. Paul. Fest. 18. M. and Osci 153 A sup.), and we find it used in Augustan writers (e.g. Verg. Aen. 7. 795) as describing Italy generally. But in history they appear only for a brief space from 340-295 b.c. (for details see Mom. C. I. L. x. pp. 451, 463, 465), and their struggle with Rome ended in complete extermination, their territory being parcelled out between the Latin colonies of Cales (founded 334 b.c., Liv. 8. 16 al.) and Suessa Aurunca (313 b.c., Liv. 9. 28), which took the place of an older Ausona (Liv. 9. 25, 8. 15), and the coloniae maritimae Sinuessa (the older Vescia) and Minturnae (both in 295 b.c., Liv. 10. 21). On the Latin form of the name with $-r$ - see Verner's Law in Italy, p. 78. It is scarcely surprising that we have no records of the Auruncan dialect, but it must, one would think, have closely resembled that of the Volsci.

## 258 Place-names ${ }^{1}$ of the Aurunci ${ }^{2}$.

A. Well attested in form, date and locality.

Aurunci cl. inscc. Ausones cl. (Ausona Liv. v. sup.) cf. Ausǒnĭa i.q. Italia cl.; the indigenous form of the name seems to survive in Ausente f.
(Vescia, -cinus cl. the ancient town of the Ausones, replaced in 295 в.с. by the Roman colony
Sǐnŭessa, -ssanus el. inscc., older Senuisanus C. I. L. x. 4727.
Pětrīnum cl. e.g. Hor. Epist. 1. 5. 5.
Massǐcus M. cl. M. Massico.
${ }^{1}$ For the arrangement and notation see the List of Signs and Abbreviations.
${ }^{2}$ The roads to Suessa and Sinuessa given by the Itineraries are quoted C. I. L. x. p. 59.

Suessa (Aurunca) cl. insce. Sessa Aurunca.
Minturnae, -rnenses cl. inscc. (Ment- later insc. and MSS.)
Mărīcae palus, lucus, cl.; Mărīca=Minturnae Hor. Od. 3. 17. 7.

## B. Less certain.

Caedicii Plin. v. Mom. C. I. L. x. 4727.
Sinope, a traditional or mythical name of a Greek city on the site of Sinuessa Pl. 3. 5. 59, Liv. 10. 21.

## C. Doubtful.

Glanica, another name of Minturnae Pl. 3. 5. 59.
Trifanum between Sinuessa and Minturnae Liv. 8. 11.
Tiretius ?pons, at Minturnae Cic. Att. 16. 13.

## 259 Personal Names ${ }^{2}$ of the Aurunci ${ }^{2}$.

A. Frequent.

1. Nomina.
gens Iulia (once -11-)
Pontia
2. None of the cognomina that occur more than once call for notice.
B. Less frequent.
3. Nomina.
gens Abuccia
Acricedia
Afinia
Arria
Asinia

Cepidial.
Domitia
Epidia inf.
Flauia
Maecia inf.

Maesia
Matidia
Popilia
Tofelana
Valeria

[^64]C. Once only.

1. Nomina.

| gens Aelia | Fabia | Septimia |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Aemilia | Firidia | Sossia |
| Albinia | Iunia | Stertinia |
| Anchariena | Lieuria | Sulpicia |
| Antonia | Lutatia | Terentia |
| Braetia | Minucia | Titia |
| Cacia | Modia | Tocia |
| Caecilia | Nonia inf. | Tranquillia |
| Carisia | Octauia cf. inf. | Truttedia |
| Cassia | Orciuia inf. | Varia |
| Clodia | $\underline{\text { Paccia inf. }}$ | Petronia inf. |
| Cominia inf. <br> Cornelia <br> Decimia <br> Egnatia inf. | $\underline{\text { Plotia }}$ | Vicasia |
| Erucia | Pollia | Villia |
|  | $\underline{\text { Salluvia }}$ | Vittia |
|  |  | Volusia |
|  |  |  |

2. Among the cognomina may be mentioned:

| Aedredona | Mocimus $l$. | Saturninus <br> Ammia l. |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Bassus <br> Cerna vir | Pollio | Sulla |
| Procula | Vrsus |  |



## V. LATINIAN.

This term may be conveniently used to describe the dialects closely akin to Latin spoken by the tribes on the borders of Latium proper and in continued intercourse with the Latini from the earliest times. These are the Marsi furthest to the East, round Lake Fucinus, the Aequi in the lower Anio valley, the Hernici to the South, the Sabini of the Tiber, Nar, and Digentia valleys, and the Falisci, West of the Tiber. Naturally their local peculiarities of speech were levelled out by the idiom of their conquerors at a much earlier date than the dialects of the rest of Italy, but enough evidence remains to us in their scanty inscc., combined with the glosses and placenames, to show that their patois must be grouped with Latin rather than with the Osco-Umbrian family of dialects (to which Volscian belonged) ; in particular they ${ }^{1}$ show the Lat. $q u$-; not the Osc.-Umb -Volsc. $p$-.

I have added to this section the very interesting archaic inscc. of Praeneste, which have been generally regarded as Latin pure and simple. In some of them, however, we have forms in which the vocalism (poloces, losna, beside polouces; coraueront ; mircurios with - $i$-) seems akin rather to that of 'rustic' Latin; and a Praenestine gloss ( 305 inf.) shows medial $f$.

The oldest of them all, that of the famous NTumasioi- fibula ( 280 inf.) dates from a period when it is impossible to say whether any differences between Latin and the other members of the group had yet been developed.

The question is complicated by the Etruscan influence which appears in the insce. of the bronzes (287-304). We know from Latin authors that peculiarities in the Latin of Praeneste were recognised at Rome itself in the times of Plautus (see 305 inf.) and Lucilius (Quint. 1. 5. 乞56, quoted 309 inf.), and we are therefore bound to reckon as 'dialectic'

[^65]at least such inscc. as show any variation ${ }^{1}$ from regular Latin of their period, so far as we know it. Further study may show that the differences are smaller than they appear at present.

As the cistae and specula of Praeneste are all of similar workmanship, I have not excluded any of their inscc., though some contain no forms that can be distinguished from those of the purest urban Latin. Finding also that some of the Personal Names of Praeneste and Tusculum occurred nowhere else in Latium, I have separated those of this region from the rest.

The Duenos insc. of the Quirinal is so important to all students of Italic grammar that its addition (in Note xxxv) hardly needs an apology. It seemed also desirable to add in the three following notes the Placenames and Personal names of Latium proper, and the more ancient names of localities in Rome itself.

The Marsian, Aequian and Faliscan inscc. have been chosen on a similar principle, that is, I have inserted all the preclassical inscc. of these districts which appear to vary from the normal urban Latin of their time, including several which previous editors have regarded simply as Latin.

[^66]
## A. Marsi.

The Marsi, whose chief centre was Marruvium on the Eastern shore of Lake Fucinus, are first mentioned as members of a confederacy with the Vestini, Paeligni and Marrucini (Liv. 8. 29, cf. 8. 6, and Polyb. 2. 24. 12). They joined the Samnites in 308 b.c. (Liv. 9. 41), and on their submission became allies of Rome in 304 b.c. (Liv. 9. 45). After a short-lived revolt two years later, for which they were punished by loss of territory (Liv. 10. 3), they were re-admitted to the Roman alliance and remained faithful down to the Social War, their contingent (e.g. Liv. 44, 46) being always regarded as the flower of the Italian forces (e.g. Hor. Od. 2. 20. 18). The Latin colony of Alba Fucens near the N.W. corner of the lake was founded in the adjoining Aequian territory in 303, so that from the beginning of the third century the Marsians were in touch with a Latin-speaking community, to say nothing of the Latin colony of Carsioli ( 298 B.c.) further west. The earliest pure Latin insce. of the district seem to be C. I. L. IX. $3827^{1}$ and 3848 from the neighbourhood of Supinum, whose character generally is of the Gracchan period, though it might be somewhat earlier.

Mommsen (U.D. p. 345) points out that in the Social War all the coins of the Marsian 'consul,' Q. Pompaedius Silo, have the Latin legend Italia, while the other leaders in all but one case (201 c sup.) used Oscan.

The chief record of the dialect or patois we owe to the goddess Angitia, whose chief temple and grove stood at the S.W. corner of Lake Fucinus, near the inlet to the emissarius of Claudius (and Prince Torlonia), and the modern village of

[^67]Luco. She ${ }^{1}$ was widely worshipped in the central highlands (Sulmo C. I. L. IX. 3074, Furfo (Vestinorum) Note xxviii. b, p. 261 sup., and perhaps Aesernia 167 sup., though that is cut on a ring which may have been carried far) as a goddess of healing, especially skilled to cure serpent bites by charms and the herbs that grew in the Marsian woods. Her worshippers naturally practised (and their descendants practise ${ }^{2}$ ) the same arts, their country being in Rome counted the home of witcheraft, see Hor. Sat. 1. 9. 29, Epod. 17. 28 etc.

The only evidence of the date of the inscc. is in their $\alpha \beta$, but this enables us to place most of them, i.e. those whose originals are still in existence, between, say, 280 and 150 b.c. (except 268, which is probably later). They all show the rounded forms of 0 and $c$, which we find superseding the angular on the coins of Aesernia ( 185 sup.) soon after 262 b.c. On the other hand all but 268 have $\vee$, which at Rome gave way to the rectangular $L$ soon after 186 (S. C. de Bacc.), see Ritschl, Opusc. iv. p. 765. The differences between the alphabets of Luco (with $₹ \mathrm{E}$ and O ) and Marruvium (with II and $\cap$ ) may be local rather than chronological, since the latter signs are characteristic of the Marrucine $a \beta$ of Teate further East (243 sup.). The $\beta$ ovatpoф ${ }^{2}$ óv arrangement of the bronze of Luco (267) is no doubt to be attributed also to 'E. Italian' influence, since this is a characteristic feature of the very ancient inscc. of the E. coast, formerly called 'Sabellic,' for which see the Appendix.

## 260-1 Inscriptions of Marruvium.

260 On two fragments of stone now built into a wall, near together, in the possession of Sign. Graziani of Luco, but found at S. Benedetto (Marruvium). The text is from impressions which I owe to De Nino; (b) was first published by Fiorelli Not. Scav. 1878 p. 254, and (from a sketch of Sign. Colantoni) in C. I. L. IX. p. 349, (a) Not. Sc. 1881, p. 193.

[^68]\[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { (a) pe uip..... | ioue } \\
& \text { (b) } \ldots . . .0 \text { po ..... | i]ouies pucl. }
\end{aligned}
$$
\]

The $\alpha \beta$ is of the Rapino type ( 243 sup.) but later, since $\cap$ and $C$ are rounded, p and E are half-rounded ( $\Gamma$ and $\Gamma, \zeta$ ); e is $\|$, the interp. single.
(a) 1 p seems fairly clear, then the lower half of a hasta; no two of the three are near enough together to be $\|=e . \quad 2$ What the injured sign is at the end I do not know.
(b) 1 The stone is broken off shortly before the first $\mathbf{0}$, and the small space left is damaged ; the first sign after the 2nd interp. may be bor $\mathbf{s}$, possibly | or $\Gamma$. 2 Traces of i] are very faint, the rest clear; after 1 apparently a hasta.

For the deities here mentioned of. 210 sup. with the note. Buicheler, Rh. Mus. 39 (1879), p. 639, C. I. L. l.c., Zvet. It. Med. 38.

261 Found in the same place, now also in the possession of Sign. Graziani of Luco : the text is from an impression sent me by De Nino, compared with Mommsen's C. I. L. Ix. 349.

## .sos s.... | nouesede | pesco pacre

Lightly cut on very rough stone now about 12 in . by 7 , the letters $1 \frac{1}{4} \mathrm{in}$. high; $\alpha \beta$ like that of 260 , more fully rounded ( $S$ ); a is $A$. The impression seems to show traces of a line broken away above 1. 1. The first letter of 1.1 is greatly broken, generally read \|e, Mom. i; only the second hasta is clear, and before what was taken for the first there is room for another sign; after sOS there seems to have been a punct and then another word of which only the first letter is at all legible. 1.2 is clear ; there is a (probably accidental) oblique stroke over the first hasta of the second e , so that-stid- might be read. $\quad 3$ is clear.

De Nino's impression shows that the insc. is less complete than has hitherto been assumed. For the di Nouensides cf. 309 inf . s.v.
U. D. p. 339, C. I. L. l.c., Zv. It. Med. 37.

## 262-4 Inscriptions of Lecce and Ortona.

262 From Mommsen C. I. L. Ix. 3812 ; 'in iugo supra Castelluccio di Lecce nuper rep., est ibi in domo Sign. Terrae. Recognovi.'

## $u$ uetius 㫙 $f \mid$ ualetudne $\mid d d \mathrm{dm}$

'Litteris vetustissimis. Dubitari potest utrum tertia sit \| an R.' Mom. But $e$ in 1.2 is $E$.

## aninus uecus ualetudne donum dant

${ }^{\text {' Litteris non tantae antiquitatis }[E \text { not II]. Aninus vicus hinc inno- }}$ tescit.'

264 Given by Lanzi Saggio di ling. Etr. iii. p. 619 (ed. 2, p. 533), tab. xvi n. 2 and 3 , from a sketch by Tomassetti, who found it on a flat stone covering a paved hollow within which were enins etc. Above the stone was a square block with ring to lift it by, so that the hollow seems to have served as a 'collecting-box' for offerings. It appears to have been found near Ortona. Text acc. to Mommsen's reading.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& u \text { atiedius | uesune | erinie et | } \\
& \text { erine | patre | dono meri | libs }
\end{aligned}
$$

${ }_{a \beta}$ apparently angular and archaic $(\diamond, L$. and $\lambda, I I)$; there can be little doubt that Mom. has read the doubtful letters rightly; they are somewhat obscured in the facsim. (U.D. tab. xv, whence Zv. I. M. vi. 4), where the first $s$ is $J$, the second $J$. For libs $=$ libens of. the note to 272.

$$
\text { U. D. p. 345, C. I. L. Ix. 3808, Zv. It. Med. } 39 .
$$

## 265-6 Inscriptions of Supinus Vicus (Trasacco).

265 From Mommsen C. I. L. Ix. 3847 ; 'Trasacci rep. Iacet ibi ante aedes I. P. Sartere. Descripsi.'

## st staiedi | u saluiedi | pe pagio | fougno | aram

'Litteris antiquissimis,' $\lambda, E^{1}, F^{1}, G, L, O, \Gamma, \zeta$ and $\mathcal{G}$. The tail of the first $g$ is added loosely beneath. Compare a similar dedication to the god of the lake C. I. L. Ix. 3656 (from Marruvium) C. Gavius, L. f., C. Veredius C. f. Mesalla Fucino v. s. l.m.

266 On a cippus found built into a gate at Trasacco, now at Luco ('in vinea Placidi,' which now belongs to Sign. Ach. Graziani). The text is Mommsen's (C. I. L. $\mathrm{I}^{1}$. 183, Ix. 3849), confirmed by my .own reading and an excellent impression which I owe to De Nino.

> uecos supn | uictorie seinq | dono dedet | lubs mereto | queistores | sa magio st f | pac anaiedio st

Rather less archaic characters; $A, C, E, C, L, O, \Gamma$ and $P, S$ and C, $T$.

The full form of the second word appears from C. I. L. Ix. 3906 P. T. Sex. Herennieis Sex. f. Ser. Supinates (from Alba Fucens), where the $i$ in Supin- is the 'longa.'

## 267-8 Inscriptions of Lucus Angitiae (Luco).

## 267 The Bronze of Lake Fucinus.

Found in 1877 in dredging Lake Fucinus near its W.S.W. shore (see Sign. Rotrou in C. I. L. Ix. p. 349), near the remains of what must have been the wall of an ancient city afterwards submerged by the lake. Formerly in the Museum of Prince Alessandro Torlonia, but now, unhappily, lost. In April 1894 it was not in the Museum at Avezzano, and the Prince's agent, Sign. Nesbitt, assured
${ }^{1}$ Not \| and $\|$, but whether the cross strokes are horizontal or inclined be does not say.
me it had never been there; while the agent at Rome could only say that 'it ought to be at Avezzano.' The text is from Barnabei's photograph, Zvet. It. Med. vii. 1.
caso cantouiols aprufclano cei $\mid \mathrm{p}$ apur finem e... salicom $5,6,7,8$ en ur|bid casontonio | socieque dono|m ato.er actia | pro 9 le[gio]nibus mar|tses.

Rudely engraved in bold characters in an archaic form of the Lat. $a \beta$ ( $\lambda, B, E, F, L, O, P P, Q, R, S, T T Y$ ), on a bronze about $4 \frac{1}{2}$ in. ( 0.11 m .) square, with a line of ornamental perforations along the top and bottom, and a larger hole close to the middle of each side, by which no doubt it was suspended. The writing is ßovorpoф $\eta \delta o o_{0}$ (except that 1. 4 runs from left to right, as do $11.1,3,6$, and 8 ), and in this respect it is unique among Italic inscc.; see above p. 290. The interpunct seems fairly regular, but is absent after apur in 1. 3, en in 1.4 : after finem (3) it can scarcely be made out under the rust; in l. 4 there can be little doubt that it should stand after $m$, not after 0 as it appears to; in 1.7 it may have been on the fragment that is broken away. But for this loss in the middle of 11. 7 and 8 and the wear and tear of the right-hand margin, which only touches the text at the end of 1.8 and beginning of 1. 9, the inscription is complete. For its probable date see above. 3 There appears to be space for one or two letters after the damaged (and not very clear) e; should we restore [ae]salico or [ei]salico? 5 The last letter is written small under the line and is generally read as $\mathbf{0}$. Jordan thought it the right-hand fragment of an a. 6 Büch. reluctantly reads doiuom, but the third symbol (IV) is probably only $n$, engraved as carelessly as ni in $1.8(\mathbf{M})$ or the remarkable $s$ of 1. 5 (4), whose first two strokes are completely above the line. And as it stands Dressel (Dtsche. Litztg. 1883, p. 334) thinks it as near to n as to iu . 7 The fourth sign is a vertical with an angular break at its foot, hitherto read simply $i$; but Mr W. M. Lindsay suggests to me l, which seems clearly right. Only the top of the two letters after $\mathbf{r}$ is left, the a is fairly certain, but the sign before it might equally well be part of
$\mathrm{b}, \mathrm{r}$ or a as Jordan reads, or more probably 0 as Mr W. M. Lindsay suggests, the two words being atolero actia 'attulerunt Angitiae.' Dressel vouches for act- not att-, regarding a small horizontal stroke at the top of the c as accidental. 8 All edd. agree in restoring le[gio]nibus.

A similar vow on behalf of a body of Praenestines besieged in Casilinurn made by the 'praetor' M. Anicius is recorded Liv. 23. 19 ad. fin. [W. M. L.]

Büch. Rh. M. xxxiii. (1878) p. 489. 'E. S.' Lit. Centralbl. 1882, p. 1519. Jordan (with Dressel) Observ. Rom. Subsecivae, 1883, p. 2. Zv. It. Med. 43, It. Inf. 45.

268 On a conical stele which has lost its apex, and now measures 14 in . in length by $7 \frac{1}{2} \mathrm{in}$. at its broadest part. It was found in 1865-6 in the lake, and is now in the Museum of Prince Torlonia at Avezzano, where I saw it in April 1894. Published by Ihm, Ephem. Epig. viii. 174.

## sa burtio u f | iue dono | ded mereto

In later $a \beta$ than the preceding insec. ( $\left.A(?), B,\|,\|^{\prime}, O, R, T\right)$, but the a appeared to me to be without a cross stroke, and the first sign is peculiar X (Ihm gives < only), recalling the curious signs for $s$ in the ms. copy of 264 sup. The $\mathbf{i}$ of iue has what appears to be a thorn on the right, which may be accidental. I do not know the name Burtius elsewhere. Note the 'country-Latin' (Marsian) dative in -e for -ei.

Note xxxi. I regret that I was prevented from hunting for the two following fragments (Zvet. It. Med. 40 and 42 from C. I, L. IX. p. 349 and no. 3811), which are clearly corrupt in their present form.
(a) was copied by Brunn at S. M. di Luco,

$$
310 \vee \leq h
$$

the first two, the fourth, and last letters (from the right) being damaged. If it has been rightly read, Mom. justly calls the letters Oscan ${ }^{1}$.
(b) C. I. L. $\mathbf{I}^{1} .1170$, rx. 3811, from Garrucci, and therefore probably Latin, badly read.
cdimi $\mid$ iove $\mid$ sacr $|\operatorname{costf}|$ fert
where $e$ is $\|, f\|$.

[^69]
## 269 Marsian Glosses.

## A. Well attested.

hernae, herna 'saxa.' See 309 A s.v.
porculeta 'spatia inter binas uitis intermissa.'
Plin. H. N. 17. 22. 171. Interesse medio temperamento inter binas uitis oportet pedes quinos, minumum autem laeto solo pedes quaternos, tenui plurumum octonos,-Umbri et Marsi ad uicenos intermittunt arationis gratia in his quae uocant porculeta-pluuio et caliginoso tractu rariores poni, sicco densiores.

Comestores a 'collegium' of some kind at Marruvium C. I. L. ix. 3693, Baler...Iuven...ui(xit) an(nos) $l x \ldots$ colleg $[i u m]$ comesto[rum], and 3815 D. M.S. P. Gavio Maximo sodali comestores p(osuerunt). Cf. a similar body Convictores Concordiae C. I. L. III. 1825.

## 270 Place-names ${ }^{1}$ of the Marsi. ${ }^{2}$.

> A. Well attested in form, date and locality.

Līris fem. fl. cl. inscc. Lírif.
Antinum, -nates inscc., but see note to 253 sup. and C. I. L. IX. p. 349. Civita d' Antíno.
(Marrŭul̆um (Mapov́ıov), -uuius cl., -uini Pl. 3. 12. 106, (-bium Serv. ad Aen. 7. 750 and later writers), more commonly called
Marsi cl. inscc., of. Mom. C. I. L. IX. p. 349.
Cerfennia C. I. L. Ix. 5973, cf. p. 348 ; Itinn. Cerfenna mediaev. cited C. I. L. loc. cit.

Fūcĭnus L. cl. inscc., Fucentes Pl. 3. 12. 106, dat. Fougno 265 sup., cf. Alba Fucens 275 inf. Fúcino L.

Lucus Angĭtı̆ae cl. inscc. Lúco (older Lugo Kiep.)
Supinas uecos 266 sup. al.

[^70]
## B. Less certain.

*Anxa, Anxates C. I. L. ix. 3950, Anxatini Pl. 3. 12. 106, Ä̈ mss. Ptol. 3. 1. 56.
Milionia Liv. 10. 1 and 34, Dion. Hal. Frag. 17. 3.
Aninus uecus sup. 263.

## C. Doubtful.

[Archippe insula, swallowed in L. Fucinus Plin. 3. § 108.]
Plestina Liv. 10. 3.
Fresilia Liv. 10. 3.
Imeus M. Tab. Peut.
†Fstaniensis uecus (Marruuii) C. I. L. Ix. 3856. ? cf. the name
Fistanus in a public insc, of the Sullan epoch from Teramo in Not. Scav. 1893 p. 352.
Kє́ $\rho \kappa \omega \lambda a \iota$ or - $\lambda 0 \iota$ ? a spot in the centre of Italy, Diod. Sic. 37. 2. 7.
D. Further Modern names.

Trasícco, Morino, Morrea, Ortúcchio, Bisegna, Pescína, Oérchio, Celáno.

## 271 Personal Names ${ }^{1}$ of the Marsi ${ }^{2}$.

A. Frequent.

1. Nomina.
gens Alfena
Mammia

Nouia
Paccia (twice Pacia)
Octauia cf. inf.
2. With the Cognomina may be mentioned Vibius (praen.)

[^71]B. Less frequent.

1. Nomina.

2. Among the Cognomina.

| Ianuarius <br> Pansa <br> Rufinus | Rufus |
| :--- | :--- |

## C. Once only.

1. Nomina.

| gens Aburria | Bellicia | Eututia |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Aelia | Caesia | Frensedia |
| Alfidia | Caesidia | Fresidia |
| Alledia | Caluentia | Gauedia |
| Anaiedia i.e. sup. gul | Caluia cf. inf. | Gauillia |
| Annidia | Caparia | Grania |
| Arria | Cattia | Grelia |
| Ascreia | Celeria | Haruia |
| Atiedia sup. | Ceruaria | Heluia cf. inf. |
| Aufidia | Decia | Ianternina? ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |
| Auilledia | Diruitia | Lollidea |

Lucilia
Mantia
Marcia
Mescidia
Mindia
Modia
Num[i]edia
Ostilia
Pacedia
Pacidaea $l$.
Paciledia
Pagia
Paquedia
Paquia
Petedia
Plauta $l$.
Pompeia
Pomponia

Pompulla
Poppaedia
Poppidia $l$.
Rasinia
Sallusstia
Saluia
Saluiedia
Selenia
Septimia
Sexti..
Spedia
Staedia $l$.
Statedia
Statia inf.
Strabonia
Suria
Taledia
Tattia

Tetdia (p. 289 footn.)
Tettia
Tironia
Titidia
Titucia $l$.
Torinia $l$.
Turullia
Varecia
Veisial.
Venuleia
Veredia
Vetiedia $l$.
Vettedia
Vibedia
Vibediena
Vibidaia
Viblia
2. Among the Cognomina.

| Acranus <br> Corintus <br> Fucentius serv. | Kaeso | Rufillus |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Silo inf. |  |  |

## B. Aequi.

The Aequi are familiar to every reader of Livy's first decade as the constant and most dangerous enemies of Rome in the first three centuries of her existence. Their chief centre is said to have been taken in $476^{1}$ b.c. (Diod. 11. 40), and again in $389^{1}$ (id. 14. 106), but they were not finally subdued till the end of the second Samnite war (Liv. 9. 45, 10. 1, Diod. 20. 101), when they received (Cic. Off. 1.11.35) the civitas (sine suffragio), either in the Caerite or aerarian form. The latter is probable, as the Romans would be anxious to leave no centre of local self-government round which this stubborn tribe could rally. If the 'insc. of Nersae' (see App. iI) were genuine, it would show (Beloch, It. Bund p. 166) that this town did possess a local constitution, but as it is, all we know of their subsequent condition is that after the Social War the folk of Cliternia and Nersae appear united in a resp. Aequiculorum, whose Latin insce. show that it had the ordinary government of a municipium optimi iuris (C. I. L. IX. p. 388). The Latin colonies of Alba Fucens ( 304 b.c.) and Carsioli (298 B.c.) must have rapidly spread the use of Latin (or what passed as such) all over the district; through it lay the chief, and for some time the only, Roman route to Venusia, Luceria and the South generally.

On the dialect of the two following inscc. see p. 288 sup.

[^72]
## 272 Inscription of Alba Fucens.

Found, according to Garrucci (Sylloge Inscc. Lat. Addenda, p. 23) at or near Avezzano, the descendant of the ancient Roman colony, but now lost. First published by Gamurrini and Henzen in Bull. Inst. Arch. Rom. 1874, p. 82, whence Zvet. It. Med. 44.

## albsi patre

On a small bronze plate, which has a perforation at either end and must have been affixed to some votive offering. The $\alpha \beta$ is Latin, and, though it gives no certain indication of date $(A, B, \mathcal{A}, L, S, T$, and $r$ and $p$ with very open loops), seems later than all but the earliest of the previous group of insce.

The shortening of the first word (for albe( $n$ )si) is probably in writing only, not pronunciation, since Lindsay ${ }^{1}$ is probably right (Lat. Lang. pp. 12 and 177) in taking it as an example of 'syllabic writing' (Ter. Scaur. p. 15 K.) so that $b=b \bar{e}$; cf. p. 288 sup, footn. Zvet. l.c.

## 273 Inscription of Cliternia.

From C. I. L. ix. 4171, where it is given from Dressel.

## uia inferior | priuatast | t umbreni c f, precario itur; | pecus plostru | niquis agat

On a large stone which had rolled down the hillside on to the right bank of the Salte near the bridge of S. Martino below Capradosso (Cliternia). 'Litteris antiquis; $L$ potius quam $L$ '; $p$ with open loop.
C. I. L, l.c.

## 274 Aequian Gloss.

According to Ovid, Fasti 3.93, the month sacred to Mars was tenth in the year of the 'Aequicoli.' See s. v. Mamers, 309 (Sabine Glosses) A.

[^73]
## 275 Place-names ${ }^{1}$ of the Aequi ${ }^{2}$.

A. Well attested in form, date and locality.

Aequi inscc. also Aequĭcŏli, -lanus (but the latter refers to a particular municipium as well as to the tribe, see Mom. C. I. L. ix. p. 390). cl. inscc. (mss. give Equic-, Aequic-, Aequac-). Aequicus Liv., -īcŏlus Yerg. Aen. 7. 744. Stato di Cřcoli, il Cicolâno (K.).
Carsĭŏli, -lanus (-ood- -oo入-) cl. insc. Cârsoli.
Alba lacus cl. insce., Alba Fucens cl. (-ntia late); originally Aequian but later on classed as Marsian. Álbe.
Algǐdus mons-dum opp. cl.
Hǐmella fl. Verg. Aen. 7. 714 al. Imele F.
Cliternia, -ninus inscc. K $\lambda \epsilon$ ítepvov Ptol.

## B. Less certain.

Simbruini colles Tac. Ann. 12. 13, -na stagna ib. 14.22.
Nersae Verg. Aen. 7. 744 ?=vicus Neruesiae in Aequicolis Pl. 25. 8. 86, so Mom. C. I. L. ix. p. 388 . Nesce.
[Quercus sacrata in Algido, Liv. 3. 25 al.]
Tŏlēnus fl. v. inf. 310 B.

## C. Doubtful.

Vecilius mons Liv. 3. 50 (in Dion. Hal. and Diod. the site of the events is placed on M. Algidus).
Conini, Tadiates, Alfaterni (?), ('interiere') Pl. 3. 12. 108.
 Thora apud Lacum Velinum was the scene of the martyrdom of St Anatolia; v. Dict. of Geogr. s.v. Tiora.
Lista Varro, ap. Dion. Hal. 1. 14.
[Пі́кта८ паиסохєía Stra. 5. 3. 9.]
In Grani Monte? Tab. P.
Ad Lamnas Tab. P.
${ }^{1}$ For the arrangement and notation see the List of Signs and Abbreviations.
${ }^{2}$ For the routes of the Itineraries through the Aequi, v. C. I. L. Ix. pp. 203-4.

## D. Further Modern Names.

Stáffoli, Magliáno, Scírcola, Pagliára (K.).

## 276 Personal Names ${ }^{1}$ of the Aequi ${ }^{2}$.

A. Frequent.

## 1. Nomina.

| gens Aemilia | Herennia | Septimia (once Sep- |
| :---: | :--- | :---: |
| Allidia | Iegiacf. inf. | tumia) |
| Amaredia | Marcia | Sextuleia (Sest-) |
| Didia |  |  |

2. Among the Cognomina may be mentioned Ianuarius (serv.) Rufus

## B. Less Frequent.

1. Nomina.
gens Aedia
Aequicula
Alfia
Anneia
Apellia (one insc.)
Atia
Auidia
Auillia
Auilliena
Aurunculeia
Betuina
Bruttia
Caecilia
Caesidia
Caesolena (one insc.)

| Caluena <br> Camedia l. (one insc.) <br> Cameria <br> Casiena | Lollia <br> Marculeia (once Mar- <br> cleia) <br> Cassia |
| :--- | :--- |
| Claudia | Metilia |
| Cornelia | Muttia l. |
| Cresidia | Naeuia l. |
| Domitia | Nonia inf. |
| Flauia | Pescennia once, and |
| Gargilia | once -enia |
| Gauia | Petronia inf. |
| Hostilia | Pomponia |
| Iulia | Pompusia |
| Lisia (one insc.) | Popillia |

${ }^{1}$ For the arrangement and notation see the List of Signs and Abbreviations.

- From C. I. L. Ix. 3906-4176, 6349-6351 etc.

| Rubria | Tettiena l. | Valeria <br> Sabinia |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Sitedia | Varia |  |
| Saluia | Titiedia | Vettena l. |
| Sellusia (once Selu-) | Titucia | Vettia |
| Sudia (one insc.) | Tituleia | Vibia inf. |
| Sulpicia | Trebonia | Volesedia |

1a. To these may be added: Gracchus Cloelius, princeps in Aequis, Liv. 3. 25. 8.
2. Among the Cognomina.

Aeschinus<br>Apronianus

| Bassus | Statius (praen. et |
| :--- | :---: |
| Saturninus | cogn.) |

C. Once only.

1. Nomina.
gens Abucia
Acestia
Aequisia
Agasia
Aninia
Annia
Appuleia
Arennia
Arria
Arruntia
Articuleia
Asinia
Atiedia inf.
Baebidia
Betulena
Bodia
Budistia
Caesiena
Caluedia
Carcurin...
Caulia
Cauponia
Cispia
Corria?
Cosidia
Cossutia
Crustidia

| Curbisia | Olia |
| :--- | :--- |
| Curtia |  |
| Docetia | Oppia inf. |
| Ennia | Orbia |
| Fadia | Papiria |
| Flauonia | Petidia |
| Fufia | Pompeia |
| Fullonia | Pompucleia |
| Helena l. | Pontia |
| Heluacia | Poppuleia |
| Hirredia | Postumia $l$. |
| Iunia | Prifernia |
| Lartiena | Quinctia |
| Licinia | Raia |
| Longeia l. | Rania |
| Lusia | Rossia |
| Mallia | Rufertia |
| Manlia | Rufia? |
| Marceia | Rufria |
| Meuia | Runtia |
| Modia | Rupedina |
| Muicia? | Sabidia cf. inf. |
| Muluia | Saf... |
| Nouana | Saltoria |
| Numicia | Saufeia, $l$ inf. ? |
| Oblicia | Scantia |
| Ocrinia | Sergia |
| Ofillia | Sertoria |

Seruilia
Statia inf.
Strabonia
Subocrina
Sutoria
Tadia
Tamulia
Taronia

Tatia
Tetidia
Tettioleia $l$.
Thoria
Titia
Titiena
Titinial.
Treb...

Vedina.l.
Vernia
Vibenia
Vibiena $l$.
Vmbrena
Vmmi[dia]
Volceia
2. Among the Cognomina.

Copranus
December
Fucentius
Gaius (as cogn.)
Lapia, mul.
Matidia
Paapia, servus
Proculus
Scudis $l$.
Spurius

Spyche Strobilus
Sulla
Vrsus

## C. Hernici.

This tribe was the ally of the Latins from very early times, even before the Treaty of Sp. Cassius in 486 b.c. (Dion. Hal. 8. 64 and 68). They broke away from Rome in 362 (Liv. 7.6 ff.) and in 306 (Liv. 9.42), when their chief town Anagnia was taken and reduced to a praefecture, but Ferentinum, Aletrium and Verulanum were rewarded for their fidelity by being allowed to remain free municipia, a position which at that date they preferred to the civitas. The name of the Hernici, like that of the Volsci, is missing from the list of Italian peoples given by Polybius (2. 24) as able to furnish troops in 225 B.C., so that by that date their territory cannot have been distinguished from Latium generally, and it seems probable (Beloch, It. Bund p. 123), that they had then received the full Roman citizenship. The oldest Lat. inscc. of the district (from Ferentinum C. I. L. x. 5837-40) are earlier than the Social War, and present no local characteristic ${ }^{1}$. For further details of their history, see C. I. L. X. p. 572.

I know of no evidence to show that the Hernicans ever spoke a really different dialect from the Latins; but the glosses which follow indicate that they had certain peculiarities of vocabulary, such as might be expected among folk who clung to their local customs.

## 277 Hernican Glosses.

## A. Well attested.

samentum 'pellicula de hostia.'
M. Aurelius apud Fronto Ep. 4. 4. Deinde in porta (Anagnina) cum eximus ibi scriptum erat bifariam sic: Flamen sume samentum. Rogaui aliquem ex popularibus quid illud uerbum esset : ait lingua Hernica pelliculam de hostia,

[^74]quam in apicem suum flamen, cum in urbem intro eat, imponit. Büch., $R h$. Mus. 37. p. 516, suggests a doubtful derivation, adding that Mommsen (U. D. p. 348) was right in not separating Hernican from Latin.

Note further that the month sacred to Mars was sixth in the Hernican year according to Ovid Fasti 3. 89, quoted below s.v. Mamers Sabine Glosses 309 A.

## B. Less certain.

buttutti 'sonus in sacris Anagninorum.'
Charis. lib. 2 ad fin. p. 242 Keil. Buttutti fluctus quidam uel sonus uocis effeminatior, ut esse in sacris Anagninorum uocum ueterum interpretes scribunt. Buich. l.c. would read fletus, supposing it to denote the cry of women. priestesses.

## 278 Place-names ${ }^{1}$ of the Hernici ${ }^{2}$.

A. Well attested in form, date and locality.

Hernǐci, -cus cl. cf. hernae 309 A.
Verulae, -anus cl. inscc. Véroli.
Fĕrentīnum cl. -inas insc. Ferentino.
Aletrium, -trinus, -trinas cl. inscc. (sometimes -lat- in mss.) Alátri.
Ănagnĭa cl. -gnini inscc. Anágni.
Capitulum Pl. 3. 5. 63 al. C. I. L. xiv. 2960. Pîglio.

## B. Less certain.

Circus Maritimus at Anagnia, Liv. 9. 42.
D. Further modern names.

Bauco, Serrone, Antícoli di Campágna.

[^75]
## 279 Personal names ${ }^{1}$ of the Hernici ${ }^{2}$.

A. Frequent.<br>1. Nomina.<br>gensFlauia<br>Hirtia<br>Titia

2. Among the Cognomina may be mentioned

Rufus
B. Less frequent.

1. Nomina.

| gens Acerronia | Decia inf. | Ostoria |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Acilia | Decumia | Pantilia |
| Aelia | Faleria | Pontia |
| Antonia | Flaminia | Salonia |
| Aquilia | Hateria | Sextilia |
| Arria | Hostilia | Tonneia |
| Aurelia | Iulia | Valeria |
| Betiliena | Laronia | Vargunteia |
| Blaesia | Lollia | Vibia inf. |
| Caecilia | Lucideia | Viria inf. |
| Claudia | Nouia inf. | Vlpia |
| Corana | Oppia inf. |  |
| Cossutia |  |  |

2. Among the Cognomina.

Proculus
Rufinus
${ }^{1}$ For the arrangement and notation see the List of Signs and Abbreviations.
${ }^{2}$ From C. I. L. x. 5795-5959, 8343-7 ete.

| gens Abutt[ia] | C. Once only. |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1. Nomina. |  |
|  | Cominia inf. | Nonia inf. |
| Aemilia | Cornelia | Octauia cf. inf. |
| Afrena | Cuspia | Pacuuia inf. |
| Alfia | Domitia | Petilia |
| Allia | Ducenia | Petronia |
| Ancharia | Egulleia | Plotia |
| Ancharia | Eppia | Pompeia |
| Apustia | Fabia | Ragia |
| Asinia | Fuluia | Rubria |
| Aspania | Gemellia (spelt Ce-) | Rufelleia |
| Atreia | Gentia | Scribonia |
| Babullia | Hostiliena $l$. | Seia |
| Baebia | Laberia | Seruilia |
| Caesia | Liuia | Terentia |
| Caliaea | Luccia inf. | Vegellia |
| Calleia | Maecenas | Verria |
| Calpurnia | Manlia | $\overline{\text { Vettia }}$ |
| Camullia | Marcia | Vitoria |
| Catia | Motilia | Volteia |
| Ceionia | Naeuia | Vrgulania |

2. Among the Cognomina.

Aprilis
Blaesus
Fimbria

Grupus
Pera

Pollio
Posilla

## D. Praenestini.

Praeneste, one of the thirty cities of Latium (Dion. Hal. 5. 61), is first mentioned in history (Liv. 2. 19) in the year 499 b.c. when it deserted the Latins for the Romans in a war then going on. Nothing more is told us till 383 ; in that year the Praenestines quarrelled with Rome, only to be subdued by Cincinnatus four years later (Liv. 6. 21-30). In the Latin War (339 B.C.) they supported Tibur against Rome, and at the peace were mulcted of territory, but retained their own constitution (Liv. 8. 14). In 216 b.c. Casilinum was defended against Hannibal by a detachment of Praenestines, and when, after some months' siege, the town surrendered on favourable terms (Liv. 23. 17-20) the Romans offered their citizenship to the survivors of the garrison, who refused it. It is probable from App. B. C. 1. 65 that it was accepted at last under the Lex Julia of 90 b.c., but only eight years later the town was garrisoned by the younger Marius, and taken and barbarously plundered by Ofella for Sulla, who established a Roman colony in its place (id. 1. 94, and C. I. L. xiv. p. 289).

From about 250 b.c. onwards (the date has not yet been more exactly determined, see Dessau C. I. L. xiv. pp. 289 and 329) we have a series of Praenestine graves surmounted by the characteristic 'pine-apple' of local stone, containing stone coffins with rich bronze, ivory and gold ornaments beside the skeleton. From these come the bronze cistae and specula with partly (but far from wholly) Etruscan inscc. (see 287 ff. below), for which Praeneste is renowned. The caskets are unique in Italy, but a large number of mirrors of precisely similar style have been discovered in Etruria ${ }^{1}$. Hence, although a priori it would be reasonable to conjecture that objects with Etruscan characteristics came from Etruria, the evidence positive and negative seems rather to point to an Etruscan factory in or near Praeneste itself. Actual Etruscan inscc. appear on several Praenestine mirrors, Ann. Ins. Arch. Rom. 1873, p. 121, and Fabr. 2726 ff . Many of the characteristic names of Praeneste

[^76]and Tusculum ( 307 inf.) seem to show Etruscan characteristics, whether in sound or only in spelling (Cinsia cf. Etrusc. Vensi-; Craislia, Magulnia, Masclia, Matlia, Aptronia with combinations of consonants unusual in pure Italic but common in Etruscan ; Foratia with the Etr. or Falisc. $f$ - for $h$-), to say nothing of Tusculum itself. The names Aptronia, Masclia, Tappuria, Voesia, which, within the area of the Italic dialects, appear only in Praeneste and Tusculum, are all represented in Etruscan insce. ${ }^{1}$

Apart from some of its family names and the rather featureless glosses (306), Tusculum contributes nothing to our knowledge of the dialects of early Latium, since it received the full Roman franchise in 381 B.C. (Livy 6. 26 and 33 al., cf. C. I. L. xiv. p. 253), and was the earliest of all the Latin towns to become completely Romanised.

For the principle on which the following insce. have been selected see p. 287 f. sup. Their text (which is fairly certain) I have taken from the various facsimiles mentioned below; where none existed, I have relied on C. I. L. xiv. The insce. of the bronzes are collected, with other EtruscoLatin inscc., by Elia Lattes in Le Iscrizioni Paleolatine dei fittili e dei bronzi di provenienza Etrusca (Milan, 1892), to which I have added references.

## 280-304 Archaic Inscriptions of Praeneste.

## 280 The Praenestine Fibula.

Purchased in Palestrina in 1871, but first published by Helbig and Dümmler in Berl. Wochenschr. f. Kl. Phil. 1887, and Mitth. d. Deutschen Arch. Inst. Rom. ii. p. 40, now in the Museo delle Terme in Rome; Lattes p. 130, C. I. L. xiv. 4123, whence the text, which is perfectly certain.

## $\mu a \nu \iota o s ~ \mu \epsilon \delta$ Fhє Fhaкє $\delta \nu \nu \mu \sigma \iota \iota$.

The inscription is on a gold fibula or brooch, 'ad arco

[^77]serpeggiante，＇a type which at Praeneste at the time of Helbig＇s article（1887）had appeared only in tombs resembling that dis－ covered at Caere by Regulini and Galassi．This class of graves containing very little Greek ware but a good deal of Phoenician， Helbig referred to a date not later than the VI century B．C．， adding in particular that this type of fibulae had never been proved（＇verificato＇）to occur in any tombs as late as the end of the VI or beginning of the $V$ century ${ }^{1}$ ．The treaty between Rome and Carthage which Polybius（3．22）ascribes to 509 B．C．， and the alliance of Carthaginians and Etruscans at the battle of Alalia in 537 b．c．（Herodt．1．166）may be quoted as inde－ pendent traditional evidence of a connexion between Italy and the Phoenicians in this century．

The inscription is of particular interest as giving us the Greek $a \beta$ in process of naturalisation on Latin soil．It is identical with that of an inscription from Cumae of the 6th cent．B．C．（Roehl，I．G．A． 524 ；Kirchhoff，St．Gr．Alph．${ }^{4}$ ， p．120；C．I．G．8337），both in its retrograde direction and in the individual characters，except that in the latter $F$ does not occur ${ }^{2}$ ，thus we have $\mathrm{A} a, \triangleleft d, \exists e$ ，日才 probably $=f, \mid i$, W $m$ ， И $n, \bigcirc 0, \zeta s, \vee u$ ，thus showing serious differences from the $a \beta$ of Caere（I．G．A．534）．The words are separated by ：，but after Fhe we have $\vdots$ ．After the second $h$ there are the remains of a vertical stroke，half obliterated，and the $h$ itself appears as日，so that it may be a correction for A．See H．D．Darbishire， J．Phil．xvi．（1888），p． 196 （＝Relliq．Philol．p．6）；Helbig and Dümmler，l．c．；compare also Helbig，Hom．Epos ${ }^{2}$ ，pp． 30 f．and 91 f．；Bücheler，Rh．M．xlii．（1887），p． 317.

[^78]281-286 Other inscriptions of purely Praenestine origin.
281 First publishepd by Mowat, Bull. Soc. Antiq. de France 1882 p. 200, thence C. I. L. xiv. 2863 with facsim.; see Mommsen and Dessau, Hermes xix. (1884), p. 453 ; Lattes p. 131.

## orceuia numeri | nationu cratia fortuna diowo fileia | primogenea donom dedi

Rather roughly cut on a tablet of bronze in normal Latin $a \beta$ of third century в.c. (A, $E, F, L, M, N, P$ ) except for the sign for $g$, which is a reversed $c$ ( $)$ ), the symbol which at Velitrae ( 252 sup.) was used to denote $f$; the absence of $G$ so near Rome fixes the date as earlier, at all events, than 250 b.c. ; a single interp. follows each word (and primo in 1. 4) except at the end of the line. Of the $\underline{\underline{e}}$ of fileia all that appears in the facsim. is $L$, but Dessau says 'operarius uidetur uoluisse efficere E.'

Mommsen takes nationu cratia, comparing Paul. Fest. p. 167 M. to mean 'nationis gratia,' i.e. 'propter feturam pecorum.' Note the datives in -a and the genitives nationu, Diouo. For other dedications by all kinds of persons in the temple of Fortuna Primigenia see C. I. L. xiv. 2849-2888.
'Basis mutila, rep. Praeneste a. 1778. Legitur manu ignota inter Mariniana cod. Vat. 9127. f. 278. Inde C. I. L. I¹. 1540.' Dessau, C. I. L. xiv. 2875.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { coques atriensis.... | magistres rodo } \\
& \text { or[ceui...s | artemo dind q s apoli[naris...s } \mid \\
& \text { protus ae[mili...s }
\end{aligned}
$$

Dessau thinks it probable that this insc. was dedicated to Fortuna Primigenia. Why are these cook-slaves called atriensis? 'Coqui Praenestini consistere potuerunt in atrio templi cuiusdam, fortasse ipsius Fortunae.' Mom. C. I. L. I.c.

Note the forms of the nom. plural.

283 'Fragmentum marmoreum, rep. Praeneste a. 1885. Not. Scav. 1885, p. 79. Nunc apud Vinc. Cicerchiani.' Id. ib. 2876.

## fabres f p $\underset{\sim}{d}[\mathrm{~d}$

i.e. Fabri Fortunae Primigeniae d.d.

284 'Fragmentum tabulae ex lapide Albano; nunc in aedibus Cecconi.' Id. ib. 2847-8.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { apolon }[\text { i... } \mid \text { metilio... | magistere[s... | } \\
& \text { coraueron[t.... }
\end{aligned}
$$

The owner reports two further lines as once existing ' $C$. Anicio L. St... | riando,' which Dessau doubts; cf. Mom. C. I. L. $\mathrm{I}^{1} . \mathrm{p} .554 . \quad$ G and $L$ side by side fix the date roughly between 250 and 200 b.c.


#### Abstract

285, 286 Two cippi of tufa of the shape of truncated cones, originally surmounted by statuettes, found in 1882 near Praeneste, first published (with photographs) by Stevenson, Bull. Inst. Arch. Rom. 1883, pp. 14, 20, 22 (Dessau C. I. L. xiv. 2891-2). The site is that of a temple of Hercules, as a number of broken images of that deity were found there (Stevenson l.c.) close to these bases.


$285 \quad \mathrm{q} k$ cestio $\mathrm{q} \mathrm{f} \mid$ hercole donu | d]edero
$286 \quad 1$ gemenio I f pel t d | hercole dono dat lubs merto | pro sed sueq ede leigibus | ara salutus

In archaic Lat. aß like that of 281 sup., save that 0 is smaller, $\mathbf{p}$ is $\Gamma$, with $\mathcal{K}=\mathbf{k}$ as in the Duenos insc. (Note xxxv. inf.); and the use of $C_{1}$ for $\mathbf{g}$ shows that this insc. is somewhat younger than either.

In 286 the first line ends with l, which is followed by a slanting stroke to connect it with the two following letters which are put vertically beneath it ; ' d is uncertain and might be e.'

Stevenson l.c. renders : Quintus Kaeso Cestii Quinti filii Herculi donum dederunt and Lucius Geminius L. f. Pelt.. Herculi donum dat lubens merito pro se suisque; eisdem legibus (quas habet) ara Salutis.

The explanation of the form Cestio is doubtful ; in sense it clearly represents a plural. The custom of making a dedication according to the
conditions prescribed in some well-known temple is quite common; an inscription of Salona (in Dalmatia, C. I. L. III. 1933, dating from 137 A.D.) dedicates an altar with certain special provisions and then continues: ceterae leges huic arae eaedem sunto quae arae Dianae sunt in Aventino monte dictae; an altar set up by the Julian gens at Bovillae is dedicated lege Albana (id. I ${ }^{1} .807$ ), etc.; cf, also Note xxviii. sup. Jordan (Observ. Rom. Subseciv. p. 10 f. ap. Dessau l.c.) shows that this altar of Salus was at Praeneste. On lubs and merto cf. the note to 272 sup., and for further discussion of the insc. see Jordan and Stevenson 1l.cc.

## 287-304 Inscriptions on bronzes found in Praenestine tombs (see above, p. 310).

All these inscriptions except 304 and part of 291 consist simply of names attached to the figures represented in the bronze reliefs. 287-297 are on the back of pear-shaped brass mirrors whose obverse is or was smooth; the rest on cylindrical caskets. The numbers of the inscc. in C. I. L. xrv. are given immediately after their number in this volume.

The $a \beta$ of these inscc., save where exceptions are noted, is as follows:
$\lambda$ or $\lambda, B, C, D, \AA, F, H, I, L, M, N, O, \Gamma, \Omega, R, S, T, V, X$.

287 (=4094). Lattes 113 ; Helbig, Bull. Inst. Arch. Rom. 1869, p. 14. Found in 1868 , now lost sight of.

## castor amucos polouces

Amycus is bound to a tree, Castor and Pollux on either side respectively.
$288\left(=4095, \mathrm{I}^{1} 55\right)$. Lattes 114. Now in the Mus. Kircheriano at Rome, where I saw it in April 1894.

## poloces losna amuces

A goddess with a half-moon stands between Pollux and Amycus. According to the facsim. A appears beside $\lambda$ in this insc.

289 ( $=4096, \mathbf{1}^{1} 58$ ). Lattes 115 ; now in the Louvre.

## $\begin{array}{llll}a & b & c & d\end{array}$ <br> cudido uenos uitoria rit

The first $d$ is an (Etruscan's) error for $p$; the last letter is $\Gamma$, sometimes read p. According to the facsim. (P. L. M. E. xi. N) the sign for $\boldsymbol{m}$ is A , and e is rectangular.

Venus ( $b$ ) with a winged Cupid ( $\alpha$ ), and behind them a winged Victory ( $c$ ) turned to a seated youth (d). Lattes l.c. shows that uit-for uict- is parallel to an Etruscan change (cf. Utaunei Fabr. 438, Setumnal Fabr. 819 : Lat. Octav-, Septum-).
$290\left(=4097, \mathbf{I}^{1} 56\right)$, P. L. M. E. i. G, Lattes 116 ; now in the Museo Kircheriano at Rome.

$$
\begin{array}{ccc}
a & b & c \\
\text { iuno iouei } & \text { hercele }
\end{array}
$$

' Iupiter (b) sedens in solio, a dextra adstat Hercules (c), a sin. Iuno ( $a$ ).' (c) is written from r. to l. e is $F$ and $E$. iouei and hercele Lattes (p. 54) plausibly regards as Etr. nom. forms; the alternation of direction in the names occurs also (though not often) in pure Etr. inscc., e.g. Fabr. Suppl. 3. 394, Fabr. 1062.

291
(=4098). Lattes 126 ; Mommsen Eph. Epig. i. no. 24, now in the Museo Kircheriano, where I saw it in April 1894.

## painiscos marsuas uibis pilipus cailauit

The first name is generally read painsscos, but the fifth sign is \{ while I has much larger curves; hence Fabretti (Palaeog. Stud. p. 64) rightly, I think, compared a similarly 'crooked iota' on inscc. of Perugia Corp. Inscc. Ital. 1490 and 1777. However he spelt his name, the satyr in question is being chased by Marsyas round the side of a crater; the next line of the insc. is written vertically beside the scene.
$a$ is $A$ and $A, t$ is $T$.
Mom. 1.c. points out that the name of the sculptor, if it stands for Vibius Philippus, wants either a praenomen or a nomen; he would take Philippus as a praen. misplaced. This, says Lattes (l.c.), is frequent in the inscc. of S. Etruria.
$292\left(=4099, \mathrm{I}^{7} 59\right)$, now in the Berlin Museum ; P. L. M. E. i. F., Lattes 107.

## mirqurios alixentroś

Mercury and Paris.
$q$ is $Q, X+$ ś $M$ (sometimes read $m$, and certainly not to be distinguished in form from the m of first word).
$\mathbf{M O} \quad\left(=4100, \mathbf{r}^{1} 60\right)$. Lattes 117, P. L. M. E. xi. O.

## $a \quad b \quad c$ <br> oinomauos ario melerpanta

An aged king (a) seated, before him a youth (c) leads a winged horse (b).

294 (=4101). Lattes 118, Helbig Bull. Inst. Arch. Rom. 1869 p. 14.

$$
\begin{array}{cc|c}
a & b \\
\text { taseos luqorcos } & { }^{c} \text { pilonicos tasei filios }
\end{array}
$$

A beardless youth (b) threatens to sacrifice a boy (c) upon an altar, but a man (a) comes to the rescue with a drawn sword. 'Either the artist has applied wrong names to the story of Telephus and Orestes, or else he is depicting a legend of which we have no other knowledge' (Dessau).
$a$ is $A$. The interp. after tasei is large and has been read as $O$, but Helbig and Henzen maintain the reading given above.

295 (=4102). Lattes 119 ; Schoene, Ann. Inst. Arch. Rom. 1870, p. 350, Eph. Epig. i. p. 14 ; now lost sight of.

## telis aiax alcumena

Ajax is being armed by 'telis,' on the other side is 'alcumena' wearing a wreath and playing a lyre; on the ground sits a drinking satyr. If 'telis' means Thetis, it is tempting to suppose that it was this mis-writing that gave rise to Varro's statement (R. R. 3. 9. 19) antiquos Thetim Thelim dixisse, a passage long since compared with this insc. But if so, the names here must have been chosen completely at random; in any case Ajax and Alcmene must be chance companions.

296 (=4103). Lattes 108.

## uictoria alixentros

[^79]
## ceisia loucilia fata ret iunio setio atos ret acila metio casia

' Imberbis iuuenis (metio) cuius in gremio sedet puella nuda (casia) ornata armillis; ad sin. puella (acila) chitone vestita et speculum tenens'; on the right another handmaid; Helbig takes the whole for 'a scene of domestic life.' The first line is adscribed vertically. Jordan guesses at the meaning of the words in Krit. Beitr. p. 72 ff . t in metio is 十, elsewhere $T ; c$ is $\zeta, \boldsymbol{n} \Gamma, 0$ is open $(\cap)$; the first letter of fata may be $\zeta=c$, and atos may be aios.

298 (=4105). Lattes 120; now in the Berlin Museum ; Helbig Eph. Epig. i. n. 21 (also p. 153 n.).

## iuno iouos mercuris hercle apolo leiber uictoria menerua mars diama fortuna

' Minerva Martem puerum sustinens supra dolium aut aqua aut igne repletum; adstant numina nouem.' Dessau quotes a conjecture as to what they are all doing.

The second, eighth and tenth names are written from r. to $1 . r$ in hercle is $\uparrow$ (this word has only recently emerged beneath the mould), and $m$ in diama is clearly also an error of the engraver's.
iouos and hercle are noteworthy forms, apparently nominative.
$299\left(=4106, I^{1} 1500\right)$. Lattes 122 ; now in the Vatican Museum.

## micos aciles uictoria hercles diesptr iuno mircurios iacor aiax uepitus

'Mercurius, adstantibus Junone Joue patre Hercule, trutinam tenet, fata scilicet dispensans iuueni qui adstat uoltu sollicito (iacor); seorsum stant ab altera parte Aiax homo loricatus cui mulier (uepitus) galeam porrigit, ab altera parte Achilles cui et ipsi galeam porrigit dea Victoria; pone Achillem puer (micos) cum equis.'
a is $\lambda, \Lambda$ and $\uparrow ; 0$ is $O$, 0 and $\cap, s$ is $S, \zeta$ and $\rangle ;$ the third name is written from r. to l., and in the next h is 7 , though the other letters of the name are normal. Lattes l.c. shows that both the use of the symbol for $h$ and its reverse position before $E$ are characteristically Etruscan. The last name is VFNTVS, generally taken to mean virtus, with $\boldsymbol{\Gamma}=r$ as in 298, while in uictoria ( $r$. to 1 .) it appears as $D$, elsewhere $R$.

For a conjecture as to iacor see Jordan Krit. Beitr. p. 62 f. For diesptr cf. note to 272 sup.

## venus aucena | alixentr.. ateleta alsir helena casenter crisida aiax oinumama alses

Venus and Aucena are goddesses, each in a triga, engraved on the lid of the casket. Round its sides are two groups; in the first Paris seems to be judging the beauty of three new competitors, the women whose names follow his ; the second consists of two Amazons with their characteristic 'pelta' (Casenter(a) and Oinumama), a warrior armed (Ajax), a woman holding up a cup (Crisida), and a youth with a pike leaning on an altar or tomb beneath trees. Engelmann (Wochenschr. Class. Phil. 1887, p. 380) compares (from Plin. 35. 3. 17) a picture at Lanuvium in which Atalanta and Helen stood together naked.

The words are carelessly written; $\mathbf{a}$ is $\lambda, \hat{\Lambda}$, and $A ; 0$ is $\cap ; h$ is written $F$ (cf. 299), though here it might conceivably be read $\nabla$. casenter is from r. to l., and its last $e$ is only 1 ; the first letters of the last word are quite uncertain $(\wedge L)$.

301 (=4108). Lattes 123; Schöne Ann. Inst. Arch. Rom. 1870, p. 335, Mon. d. Ist. 1870, vol. ix. tab. 22-3. 'Was for sale in Paris in 1884.'

## silanus doxa ladumeda aiax oilios leces soresios acmemeno istor lauis | ebrios

A group of figures round Ajax Oilios (Aỉas Oỉdádins, who holds two horses), doing nothing in particular; doxa and ladumeda are girls with a dove and a doe respectively, leces (i.e. leges) is the label of a tablet hanging from a tree behind; soresios and istor are youths looking at Ajax; lauis is of the opposite sex; ebrios is prudently allowed a picture to himself on the cover. The other names explain themselves, though not their owners' precise occupation, which, no doubt, is a lost chapter of myth. Bücheler conjectures a derivation for Soresios in Comm. Phit. in hon. T. Momm. p. 229. $\mathbf{o}$ in oilios is small and has been taken for a punct; $\boldsymbol{d}$ in ladumeda is sometimes read 0 , but is more like $d$; else the text is certain.

302 (=4109). Lattes 124; Helbig, Bull. Inst. Arch. Rom. 1872, p. 107, Eph. Epig. i. p. 153 n.

## creisita [h]elena aciles simos oreste[s] tondrus seciolucus

Chrysis and Helen are standing at a basin, Achilles holds a horse; simos is lightly clad and laden with a bag of farm-yard live-stock; tondrus (? Tyndareus, Jordan Krit. Beitr. p. 55 f.) is a bald old man with a dog; then comes a lady who has unhappily lost her label, and then seciolucus with a horse. His fifth letter is very small and is confidently read by Helbig for a punct, lucus being taken as the horse's name.

303 (=4110). Lattes 125; Helbig, Bull. Inst. Arch. Rom. 1869, p. 132, Mon. Inst. ix. tab. 24-5.
$\stackrel{a}{c}$ c]astor pater poumilionom
(b) which is written from r. to l. is the label of 'homunculus deformis et obesus (Pygmaeus)'; several persons are looking on at his interview with

Castor and Pollux, the latter of whom is not labelled; the pigmy is most laughable. The $\mathbf{c}$ of c]astor is covered by a boss put on later; $\mathbf{u}$ might be L.
$304\left(=4112, \mathrm{I}^{1} 54\right)$. Lattes 129 ; seen by me in 1894 in the Museo Kircheriano, to which it was given by Ficoronio in 1740, no doubt from Praeneste, see Dessau C. I. L. XIV. l.c.

## dindia macolnia fileai dedit

 nouios plautios med romai fecidThese two lines are on the handle of a casket which is larger and more finely worked than any of the others, with reliefs representing the story of Pollux and Amycus; the handle and feet were added subsequently by an inferior workman (who may or may not have been Nouios Plautios). The Dindii and Magulini are both Praenestine families: see 307 inf .

The two lines of letters are on the handle, placed thus:
NOVIOS........

The $\alpha \beta$ has $\lambda$ and $\cap$, but is else regular.
The e of fileai is possibly Praenestine, but the difference of ending between fecid and dedit is due either to difference of date (of which the letters give else no indication), or more probably to the fashionable use of an archaic form by the artist in his own signature.

Under one of the feet are some ten letters or signs, of which ma, the first two (counting from r. to l.) and a the last are alone clear (C. I. L. xiv. 4113). The $m$ has five strokes.

Note exxii. In the string of names alluded to on p. 287 footn., two variations of spelling may be noted as possibly indicating a shade of difference in the Praenestine pronunciation of $i$; Fabrecio in 3178 beside -ric- in the rest of the family group; and Saufeia alternating with Saufia in 3244-3252.

Note xxxiii. A curious batch of inscc. on a bronze is given by Duvau, Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire x., with a facsim. tab. vi. (whence Lattes 133), of which the following account may be given. D. vouches for the insc., and it
seems almost too curious for a forgery, though it is suspicious that he is not allowed to say where the bronze is. With the use of the imperative in such a picture cf. é $\gamma \chi \in \iota \dot{\eta} \delta[\stackrel{\nu}{\nu}]$ otvov on a red-figured amphora with a boy pouring out wine, now at Paris (Kretschmer Gr. Vaseninschrr. p. 85).

## confice piscim

Said by an energetic cook (who is taking down from hooks two hind quarters of some animal) to another who is cutting or frying something; written l. to r.

## coenalia

Along the hind quarters that are being taken down; written r. to 1.

## cofeci

Said (r. to l.) by a man holding out a dish of viands in response to another holding an empty dish downwards who says ( r . to 1.)
feri porod (or potrod?)
Then come two people stirring up a caldron, one with a very long stick, the other with a short stick touching something in the caldron, and in the other hand holding a platter with lumps on it. The one says (1. to r.)

> made mire cie or maden isecie (? madent regie).
[No interp., but a space after the first $e$; the last stroke of $m$ may be an interp.]

The other (r, to 1.)

> misc sane

Next the words
asom fero [no interp.]
are said by a man with five balls on a skewer who is walking away quickly, another skewer with like balls seems to have been held in his other hand, where there is now a break. The a $\alpha$ shows $\uparrow a,\langle C$ and (cofeci, misc) टc, $\mathcal{E} e, \mathcal{F}$, $\downarrow l, \bigcirc$ (but in coenalia $\Omega$ ) for $o, \mathrm{P} p, \mathrm{R} r$, but in porod $T, S s$.

## 305 Praenestine Glosses.

## A. Well attested.

## conea 'ciconia.'

Plaut. Truc. 677, Stratyllax. Tene tibi Rabonem habeto...Astaphium. Perii, rabonem! quam esse dicam hanc beluam? Quin tu arrhabonem dicis? Str. A facio lucri, Ut Praenestinis conea est ciconia.

## medidies 'meridies.'

Varro L. L. 6. 4. Meridies ab eo quod medius dies. D antiqui, non R in hoc dicebant, ut Praeneste incisum in solario uidi.

The Lat. and Praen. forms are clearly parallel, but not necessarily identical, so that there is no need to follow Varro in deriving meri-from medius.

## nefrones 'testiculi.'

Paul. ex F. 163 M. (s. v. nefrendes). Sunt qui nefrendes testiculos dici
 nefrones.

Cp. also Fest. 277 M. Rienes quos nunc uocamus antiqui nefrundines appellabant, quia Graeci $\nu \in \phi$ poús eos uocant.
tammodo 'modo.'
Plaut. Trin. 611 (quoted by Fest. 359 M.). Call. Quamdudum istuc aut ubi actumst? Stas. Ilico, hic ante ostium, Tammodo, inquit Praenestinus.

## tongitio 'notio.'

Paul. ex F. 357 M . Tongere nosse est, nam Praenestini tongitionem dicunt notionem. Ennius : Alii rhetorica tongent.

The fragment of Festus ad loc. seems to give the verb the further meanings of '[la]tius dominari' and ' uincere,' and refers the interpretation ' noscere' to '[Aelius Sti]lo.'

Note exxiv. Of two archaic insce. of Tusculum (C. I. L. xiv. 2577-8, P. L. M. E. zlix. G. and B. whose aß shows A F $\downarrow \cap \sqcap \mathrm{R}$ ) only the first shows any form which, in our present knowledge, seems to belong to 'country' rather than urban Latin (the dat. fem. sing. in -e);
$m$ fourio $c f$ tribunos $\mid$ militajre de praidad fortune dedet.
The other is identical save that the dedication is maurte instead of fortune, and that militare appears complete. Ritschl (1.c. Enarr.) raises a doubt whether the insc. is not of later date than $\cap$ and $\downarrow$ would suggest; his reason being, I suppose, that the letters are very accurately cut and have (very slight) finials.

## 306 Tusculan Glosses.

## A. Well attested.

## cenaculum 'dining-room.'

Varro L. L. v. 162. Ubi cenabant cenaculum uocitabant, ut etiam nunc Lanuui apud aedem Iunonis et in cetero Latio ac Faleriis et Cordubae dicuntur.

## deus Maius 'Jupiter.'

Macrob, Sat. 1. 12. 17. Sunt qui hunc mensem (Maium) ad nostros fastos a Tusculanis transisse commemorent, apud quos nunc quoque uocatur deus Maius qui est Iupiter.


Fest. 257 M. Quinquatrus appellari quidam putant a numero dierum, qui feriis his [cod. fere his] celebrantur. Quod scilicet errant tam hercule, quam qui triduo Saturnalia et totidem diebus Competalia, Nam omnibus his singulis diebus fiunt sacra. Forma autem uocabuli eius, exemplo multorum populorum Italicorum enuntiata est, quod post diem quintum Iduum est is [cod. his] dies festus, ut apud Tusculanos Triatrus et Sexatrus et Septematrus, et Faliscos, Decimatrus.
struppus 'quod in puluinari imponatur Castoris.'
Fest. 313 M. Stroppus est, ut Ateius Philologus existimat, quod Graece $\sigma \tau \rho o ́ \phi \iota \nu[$ Cod. $\sigma v \rho 0 \phi-]$ uocatur. Et quod sacerdotes pro insigni habent in capite. Quidam coronam esse dicunt, aut quod pro corona insigne in caput imponatur, quale sit strophium. Itaque apud Faliscos diem [cod. idem] festum esse qui uocetur Struppearia, quia coronati ambulent. Et a Tusculanis, quod in puluinari imponatur Castoris, struppum uocari. Similarly Paul. ad loc., giving only the form stroppus. On the relation of $\phi$ to $-p p$ - cf. p. 227 footn. 2.

Ovid, Fasti 3. 89-93, states that the month sacred to Mars at Tusculum, as at Alba and Aricia, was the third in the year, while the Laurentes (i.e. the people of Lauinium, Note xxxvi. inf. A) counted it the fifth: see below s.v. Mamers in 309 A.

## 307 Personal Names ${ }^{1}$ of Praeneste and Tusculum ${ }^{2}$.

| A. Frequent. |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. Nomina. |  |  |
| gens Aelia | Domitia | Pompeia |
| Anicia | Fabia | Popillia (-ilia) |
| Annia (Ania) inf. | Fabricia | Rutilia |
| Antistia (-test-) | Flauia | Samiaria |
| Antonia | Iulia | Saufeia (Saufia) |
| Aurelia | Iunia | $\overline{\text { Selicia }}$ |
| Caecilia | Maeuia <br> Magolnia (bis) | Sulpicia |
| Caesia (once Ceis-) | $\left\{\begin{array}{l} \text { Magolnia (bis) } \\ \text { Magulnia ," } \end{array}\right.$ | Tampia (Tapia) |
| Calpurnia | $\left\{\begin{array}{ll}\text { Macolnia } & "\end{array}\right\}$ sup. | Terentia |
| Cestia | Mgolnia (semel) | Tondia (twice -deia) |
| Claudia | Marcia | Tullia (once Tulia) |
| Clodia (far less common than Claudia) | Octauia cf. inf. | Valeria passim Vatronia |
| Cominia(twice -men-) | Opia (Oppia) | Vibia inf. |
| inf. | Orceuia (twice Orci- | Vlpia |
| Cornelia | Petronia (once Ptro- | Voluntilia (once Vo- |
| Decumia (once -cim-) |  | lent-, once Volnt-) |
| dia) sup. | Plautia |  |
| 2. Among the Cognomina may be mentioned |  |  |
| Maio praen. mul. | Rufinus | Rufus |
| Mino praen. mul. |  |  |

B. Less frequent.

1. Nomina.
gens Acilia
Acutia (once Aq-)
Aemilia
Agreia
Albinia

| Appalia <br> Appuleia <br> Aptronia <br> Aquilia <br> Aquillia | Arrecina <br> Ance each. |
| :--- | :--- |
| Arria |  |
| Asinia |  |
| Ateia (once Atte-) |  |
| Atellia |  |

${ }^{1}$ For the arrangement and notation see the list of Signs and Abbreviations.
${ }^{2}$ From C. I. L. xiv. 2575-3431, 4090-1, 4094-4126, 4231-3, 4276-7.

| Atidia | Insteia | Raecia |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Atilia | Lateria | Romania |
| Auillia | Lepidia | Roscia |
| Aulia | Licinia | Saluia |
| Aurunceia | Lollia | Samia |
| Baebia | Luscia | Satricania |
| Billiena $l$. | Maesia (one inse.) | Scribonia |
| Brittia | Maia | Scurreia |
| Buticeia | Mamia | Sehia |
| Cacuria | Mamilia | Seia |
| Caelia | Manilia | Sentia |
| Caltia | Manlia | Sentidia |
| Camelia | Mantennia (oneinsc.) | Septimia |
| Caninia | Messena (one insc.) | Seruilia |
| Cassia (once Casi-) | Messiena (one insc.) | Sicinia <br> Signina? (one insc.) |
| Cispia | Metilia (once Maet-) | Silia inf. |
| Cluuia (once and once | Minucia | Silicea (one insc.) |
| Cluia) | Mucia (once Muucia) | Statia inf. |
| Coelia | Mufeia (one insc.) | Statioleia |
| Colionia | Mummia | Stertinia |
| Cordia | Mutilia | Taemule[ntia] l. (one |
| Corellia | Neronia | insc.) |
| Coriaria | Nitentia (one insc.) | Tattia (one insc.) |
| Cornificia | Niuellia (one insc.) | Titionia |
| Corucania? (oneinse.) | Nouia | Tossia (one insc.) |
| Cupia | Numitoria | Trebonia |
| Curtia | Orbia | Trebulana |
| Cusinia | Ouia (once Oueo nom. | Turpleio nom. sg. |
| Dolutia | sg. masc.) | masc. (one insc.) |
| Egnatia | Passiena | Tusculania |
| \{Epoleia | Pinnia | Tutia |
| Epuleia(onceEppul-) | Placuleia (one insc.) | Vehilia |
| Etrilia | Plaetoria | Velia |
| Fania (one insc.) | Plancia? (one insc.) | Venidia (one insc.) |
| Feidenatia | Plotia | Verria (one insc.) |
| Fictoria | Plotina | Vettenia(once-ennia) |
| Galeria | Plutia | Vettia |
| Gavia | Pomponia | Veturia |
| Gegania | Pontia | Vinicia inf. |
| Geminia (once-menio | Postumia (late) | Vitellia |
| nom. sg. masc.) | Publicia (once Pob-) | Volcacia |
| Gungia | Pulia (once Pullia) | Volumnia |
| Heluidia | Quintilia (once | Volusia |
| Herennia (once -enio | Quinct-) | Vsoro nom. sg. masc. |

## 2. Among the Cognomina.

$\frac{\text { Abenna }}{\text { insc.) }}$ vir $l$. (one Ianuarius Pollio
C. Once only.

1. Nomina.

| gens Abennia mul. l. | Bussenia | Flauoleia |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Abudia | Cabarasia | Folia |
| Accia | Caecina | Foratia |
| Acestia | Caesennia | Fresidia |
| Acidia | Caleia | Fufia |
| Aconia | Camidiena | Fuluia |
| Aennia? | Capiuas | Gaia |
| Afilia | Carmeia | Gallia |
| $\overline{\text { Agilia } l .}$ | Carol [ia] | $\underline{\text { Gauidia }}$ |
| Agusia | Carullia | Gellia |
| Aiacia | Cassidaria | Hateria |
| Alfenatia | Catia | Hirtilia? $l$. |
| Alfenia | Caucia | Horatia |
| Alfenia | Ceionia | Itelia |
| Alfia | Cepoleia | Iuuentia |
| Allia | Cincia | Laecania |
| Ampia | Cinsia | Leelia |
| Ancharia | Cloulia cf. inf. | Liguria |
| Ancilia | Cocceia | Lisia? |
| Annea | Cocia | Liuia |
| Anneia | Comia | Lorelana |
| Aponia | Corania | Lucceia |
| Aracilia | Coricia | Lucilia |
| Arlena | Cosconia | Lucretia |
| Arrasidia | Cosentana? | Luculana $l$. |
| Asconia | Cosidia | Lutatia |
| Atia | Craislia | Macrinia |
| Atinia | Cumia | Maculana |
| Atlia $l$. | Cuspia | Maecenas |
| Attia | Cutia | Mecilia (i.e. Maec-) |
| Auidia | Dasumia | Manusia |
| Barbia | Deceitia | Masclia |
| Bellicia | Durmia | Matid[ia] |
| Betiliena | Elufria | Matinia |
| Boufili [a] | Ferlidia | Matlia |
| Bruttia | Fidiclania | Mecania ? |


| Meclonia | Poldia | Tedusia |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mersieia | Poppaea | Telegenia |
| Mescinia | Prastina vir | Terebuni[a] |
| Mestria | Proclinia | Tettia |
| Mettia | Propertia | Thorenas |
| Modiaria | Proqilia | Tincia |
| Munatia | Prosia | Titia |
| Munia | Pupia | Titoleia |
| Mussetia cf. inf. | Quinctia | Toseniana? $l$ |
| Nassia | Rasinia | Trebia inf. |
| Neriana | Rotania | Trutt[e]di[a] |
| Nerlou... | $\underline{\text { Rubellia }}$ | Varena |
| Nigrinia | Rudia | Varia |
| Ninn.... inf. | Rufena | Varinia |
| Nonia inf. | Ruficana | Varronia? |
| Nouieia | Rupilia | Vassia |
| Numeria inf. | Rustia | $\overline{\text { Vebidia }}$ ? |
| Numisia inf. | Sabidia cf. inf. | Velineia |
| Nummia | Sariolena | Venilia inf. |
| Ocania | Sempronia | Venuleia |
| Ofillia | Sergia | Verania |
| Onussania | Sertoria | Veratia |
| Opilia | Seruia | Vestoria |
| Opsilia | Setia | Vetli [a] |
| Paccia inf. | Setria | Vetteia |
| Pacilia | Seueia? | Vetulenia ${ }^{1}$ |
| Pannia | Sextilia | Vibria |
| Papia | Sinnia | Vibuleia |
| Papiria | Sosia | Vipstana |
| Patoleia | Statiena | Vmbricia |
| Patronia | Statilia | Vmmidia |
| Pescno..? l. | Statiolena | Voconia |
| Peticia inf. | Statoria? | Voesia |
| Petilia | Talonia | Volunseia (i.e |
| Petisia | Tappuria | Vruineia |
| Pilia | Tarqui.... | Vsonia |

2. Among the Cognomina.

| Antula | Bauto | Daphine |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Antullus | Bosta | Dosuo |
| Anullinus | Cerdo | Egloge |
| Baaso | Cordus | Fauonilla |

[^80]| Fimbria | Nasica | Tarula |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Gaius | Paetinus | Tatis vir |
| Gemna praen. | Palicanus | Vala |
| Laurus | Rebilus | Vrsio |
| Maro | Rusonianus |  |

## 308 Lanuvian Glosses.

## A. Well attested.

mane 'bonum.'
Macr. Sat. 1. 3. 13. Mane autem dictum aut quod......aut, quod uerius mihi uidetur, ab omine boni nominis, nam et Lanuuini mane pro bono dicunt; sicut apud nos quoque contrarium est immane,... pro non bono.
nebrundines 'testiculi (rienes ?).'
จ. sup. 305 s.v. nefrones.

## Note xxxv. The Vase of the Quirinal.

The vase was found in 1880 in the valley between the Quirinal and Viminal hills close to the Via Nazionale, within the circle of the wall of Servius. "No sepulchral monuments can have existed on this site, but the vase may have been transported thither in the midst of the mass of rubble which at different times in the Classical period must have been thrown down to form the foundations of new buildings, such e.g. as were erected there under the Empire" (Jordan). Successive strata of buildings were uncovered in constructing the Via Nazionale. Other vases of similar workmanship, but uninscribed, were brought to light along with it, one of them precisely similar except that it has four compartments.

The inscription runs from right to left round the outer edge of three clay vases joined together in the shape of an equilateral triangle, and forms a band of letters round the
upper half of their curved sides. The interior of the vases is nearly cylindrical, $1 \frac{1}{3} \mathrm{in}$. ( 035 m .) deep and $1 \frac{3}{4} \mathrm{in}$. ( 045 m .) in diameter. The side of the triangle measures 6 in . ( 15 m .). The tops of the letters are turned outwards, and a line drawn along the base of lines 1 and 2 would pass close to each of the three apertures at its outermost point, except that the last three letters of 1. 2 are further outwards, overlapping the beginning of 1.1 . The first six letters of 1.3 (duenos) are smaller than those next succeeding, and removed by a slight interval from the top of 1.1 , but the rest of 1.3 follows it closely. The accompanying woodcut will make this clear.

io uei sat deiuos qoi med mitat nei ted endo cosmis uirco sied

## asted noisi ope toitesiai pacariuois <br> duenos med feced on manom einom duenoi ne med malo statod

On a ground of this shape it must have been difficult to form the letters with exactness: here and there they are run very close together, and there are five (perhaps six) places (v. inf.) in which the writer seems to have corrected a mistake. The $a \beta$ exhibits noteworthy characteristics, due to Etruscan or Greek influence. The insc. is wholly written from r. to l.; the bars of $e$ and $f$ are oblique; there are no interpuncts; $q=r$ as
in two Praenestine bronzes (298-9 sup.); in Umb. $a \beta$ the sign denotes the trilled d. m has five strokes (W), cf. 280 sup. and the note to 304 ad fin. Further we have $\mathcal{P}$ alone $=q u$. We have three forms for a (A A A); ) = $\mathbf{c}$ and $\mathbf{g} ; 0$ and once $\triangleleft=\mathrm{d}$; whether $\mathcal{\gamma}$ is $\mathbf{k}$ or a correction of it to $\mathbf{c}$ is doubtful, see below; $\checkmark(?)=1 ; 0$ is both $O$ and $\cap ; \eta=p ; 2$ and $\}=s$. $\checkmark$ the second aign of duenoi was formerly read as $z$, but I have little hesitation in reading it as $u(V)$ which had been first omitted. Comparetti (Mus. Ant. Cl. I. p. 175 foll.) conjectures that the engraver was a Greek by birth.

1. io uei sat Deecke, iouei sat vulgo. The fifth letter i (if it is not an accidental stroke) seems to have been inserted as a correction: it touches both the $e$ and $s$ and is prolonged above the line. neited Osth. and Comp., Deecke ne ited, ceteri nei ted. vir cosied Osth. 2. nois io peto, ites ia, i Pauli, $A-I t$. St. I. p. 3. The third letter of pacari is curious ( $\ddagger$ ), and seems, like the $\mathbf{c}(\subset)$ of feced (l. 3), to be an Etruscan $k$, or a correction of it. The third letter from the end has its righthand stroke prolonged with a sort of flourish which makes it more like 1 than any other $\mathfrak{u}$ on the vase, though it may be accidental. 3. I have followed Bréal and Pauli in reading duenoi ; Jordan and others read dze noine. The third letter of malo is $\mathbb{D}$ : it cannot well be n , nor a ( A ). Comp. suggests plausibly that it was first written as a Greek $\Lambda$ and then corrected. The highest stroke is fainter than the rest and seems to have been half erased.

In Am. J. Phil. x. (1889) p. 453 ff . I endeavoured to show that the insc. was a curse, and contained a translation of part of a Greek formula, another part of which appears in Oscan in the curse of Vibia ( 130 sup.); the Greek curses are given by Newton, Halicarnassus and Cnidus II. 2. 719, also by Wachsmuth Rh. Mus. 1869, p. 570 (nei ted endo cosmis virco sied $=\mu \grave{\eta}$ èví入atós $\sigma o \iota$ єl $\eta$ кoúpa, and keri lamatir in $130=\dot{a} \nu \mathrm{e}-$
 details see the article. Of earlier commentators the most important are Jordan Hermes xvi. (1881) p. 225, Osthoff Rh. M. xxxvi. (1881) p. 481; and Dressel, Ann. Ins. Arch. Rom. 1880, p. 158 , who gives the fullest account of the $a \beta$.

## Note xxavi. Place-names ${ }^{1}$ of the Latini ${ }^{2}$.

A. Well attested in form, date and locality.

Lătǐum, -tǐus, -tinus cl. inscc.
Latinienses, the country folk of the Ager Lat. counted as a municipium after 89 b.c., Cic. Har. Resp. 10, al.
Rŭtŭli cl.
Sǐcāni and Sǐcŭli (legendary early inhabitants) cl., v. Serv. ad Aen. 7. 795, Dion. Hal. 1. 9 etc.
Castrum Inui or simply Castrum, - trāni cl.
Naeuia silua (nemora), et porta cl. e.g. Varro L. L. 5. 163, Liv. 2. 11, uicus portae Naeuiae insc.
Arděa, -eas, -eatinus cl. inscc. ascribed to Daunii by Vergil Aen. 10. 615, 688 al. Ardea.

Lāuīnĭum, -īnas cl. inscc., -īnĭus poet. (? Lăuīnum Juv. 12.71): Cato apud Serv. Aen. 4.620 calls it La u rola uinium, and its inhabitants are most commonly called Laurentes Lauinates, so that the place must be identified (Dessau C. I. L. xiv. p. 186) with
Laurentum cl. (only mytholog.); Laurens, -entīnus cl. inscc.; the name extends also to
Laurentes vico Augustano inscc.; called Laurentum C.I. L. vi. 8583, Itinn.: v. Dessau C. I. L. xiv. p. 183.

Troia ad Lauinium cl. e.g. Liv. 1. 1, Cato ap. Serv. Aen. 7. 158.
Nŭmīcǐus, -īcus fl. cl. (e.g. Serv. ad Aen. 1. 259), C. I. L. xiv. 2065.
[Aphrodisium cl.]
Iūturna fons cl.
Lānŭuĭum, -uuīnus cl. inscc. (Lanuinus early inscc. Lanuuinus later, Laniuinus imperial, cf. Lànuīnus trisyll. Naev. ap. Macrob. Sat. 3. 18. [2. 14] 6.) Civita Indivina mediaev., now Civita Lavinia.
Maecium Liv. 8. 17, 6. 2. al., Tribus Maecia cl. inscc.

[^81]Ărīcǐa, -cīnus cl. inscc. Aríccia.
Trǐul̆ae lacus cl. e.g. Verg. Aen. 7. 516.
Nemus Dianae cl. insc. Nèmi.
Bouillae cl. inscc., -llenses inscc., -llanus cl. (acc. to Nonius p. 122 Merc. (s.v. hillas) Bohilla!)

Tǐběris fl. m. ¢̨ll. inscc. -bris poet. ( $\theta u ́ \beta \rho \iota s,-\delta o s)$ ), -̌riñus cl. insce. Tévere $F$.
Ostǐa n. pl. cl. insce. (also fem. sing. C. I. L. xiv. 161. Cf. Charis. I. p. 98 and p. 35 Keil, al. and Dessau C. I. L. xiv. p. 4), Ostiensis cl. inscc. (sometimes -tensis). Ostia.

Ager Solonius cl. e.g. Liv. 8. 12.
Alba (Longa), -ānus cl. inscc.
Caenīna, -nīnenses' (sacerdotes) cl. inscc.
Sacriportus cl. e.g. Cic. de Div. 2. 31.
Castri Moenium, -moenienses inscc. (-mon- Pl. 3. 5. 63) ?=Munienses Pl. 3. 5. 69.
Praenestĕ neut. (fem. Verg. Aen. 8. 561, Juv. 3. 190, -єбтos Stra. and App.), -tinus cl. insce. Palestrina.
Almo fl. cl. e.g. Ov. Fast. 4. 337.
Pědum, -ānus cl.
Rōma, -anus cl. inscc. Professedly older names are
Saturnia cl. e.g. Dion. Hal. 1. 34 and
Valentia Solin. 1. 1. 1, Fest. p. 266 M., which looks like a grammarian's invention.
Scaptia cl., - $\boldsymbol{\eta} \boldsymbol{\eta} \nu c o s ~ D i o n . ~ H a l . ~-~ t i u s ~ p o e t ., ~ T r i b u s ~ S c a p t i a, ~$ Scaptienses cl. inscc.
Corbio ${ }^{1}$, onis Liv. 2.39 al.
Vitellia ${ }^{1}$, -llenses cl. (Vetelia Mss. Liv. 2. 39).
Sublaqueum ${ }^{1}$ Tac. Ann. 14. 22 al. Subiáco.
Treba ${ }^{1}$, -ani (Tpŕ-) cl. insc. (Trebium Liv. 2. 39). Trévi nel Lázio.
Bolae (Bōla Verg. Aen. 6. 766), -anus cl.

[^82]Pupinius ager (also simply Pupinia), -inensis cl. Tribus Pupinia cl. insce.
Tuscơlum -ŭlum - $\kappa \lambda o \nu$, -lānus cl. insce.
Lă̆bīci (-ккóv, Dion. Hal., Stra.) cl. -canus cl. inscc.
Găby̌i, -bīnus cl. inscc.
Politorium cl. e.g. Liv. 1. 33, -taurini Pl. 3. § 69, so Jahn, but compare
Polusca (Poll-), $-\sigma \kappa a \nu o s,-$ scinus cl. e.g. Liv. 2.33 who refers it to the Volsci; but in Plin. 3. § 69 in the list of the peoples 'in monte Albano carnem accipere soliti' Niebuhr, Detlefsen and Sillig read Polluscini for Poletaurini of some mss. ; Politorium is mentioned separately in § 68 .

Ficana cl. e.g. Liv. 1. 33. Mars Ficanus insc.
Aqua Virgo el. inse.
Aefŭla, -lanus cl. (mss. often Aes-, e.g. Plin. 3. 5. 69, v. Hübner Hermes I. p. 426), Mons Aeflanus C. I. L. xiv. 3530, Aefulanus cognomen insce.
Tībŭr, -ris neut.; -rs, -rtīnus cl. insec. (Teib-C.I. L. xiv. 3584). On the late derivative Travertine (stone) see Keller Lat. Volksetym. p. 24. Tivoli.
Collātǐa, -tīnus, cl. (Porta Collatina, Paul. ex Fest. 37 Müll.) e.g. Liv. 1. 38.

Pons Muluius cl., Mon. Ancyr. Iv. 20. Pónte Mòle.
Semurius ager cl. e.g. Macr. Sat. 1. 10.
Antemnae, or -na cl. (Sabine in the oldest accounts, e.g. Liv. 1. 9).
Aquae Albulae cl. inscc., cf. Albula 'vetus nomen Tiberis' Liv. 1.3 al.

Curtius fons el. e.g. Plin. 36. § 122, or Albulinus riuus (Front. Aquaed. 13), and
Caeruleus fons cl., united in
Aqua Claudia cl.
Aqua Crābra cl. e.g. Cic. Leg. Agr. 3. 2.
AnĪō,-1ēnis fl. masc. cl. insce.; this is the regular inflexion (Prise. 6. p. 684 Keil), but -ièn also occurs in the nom., and -ionn- in the oblique cases. Tribus Aniensis cl. inscc. Aniène $f$.

Fīdēnae, -ēnātes cl. inscc., -ēna sing. cl. (Fǐd-Verg. Aen. 6. 773), insce. twice Feid-. On its nationality v. Dessau C. I. L. xiv. p. 453.
Nōmentum, -mentānus cl. inscc.; often called Sabine, but cf. Dessau C. I. L. xiv. p. 440. Mentána.
Allía fl. -liensis cl., C.I. L. x. 6638 p. 664 (MSS. often Alia, possibly from an error of Serv. ad Aen. 7. 717).
Ficolea (-ul-);-leates, -lenses (-ó $\nu \nu \epsilon o$ Dion. Hal. 1. 16), cl. insc. (Ficelias Mart. 6. 27). Latin or Sabine? Cf. Dessau C. I. L. xiv. p. 453 ; it cannot be separated from Nomentum sup.
Crustŭmĕrŭum Liv., Verg. Aen. 7. 631; also -meria Liv. (and
 -mīnus both cl. Tribus Crustumina and Clu- both cl., the latter more freq. on inscc., cf. Momms. Staatsr. 3. p. 153.
Săcrāni, -ānus cl. e.g. Fest. p. 321 M.
Corniculum, -lanus cl.
Medullia (-llum Pl. 3. 5. 68) -1lini cl. insc. (C. I. L. $\mathrm{I}^{11}$ p. 284).
Cameria, -rium, -rini (- $\mu \kappa \rho$, , - $a \rho-$ ) cl. insc. (gens Cameria inscc.).

## B. Less certain.

Ortona on the Aequian border Liv. 2. 43, 3. 30.
Koúkov $\begin{gathered}\text { ov Stra. 5. 3. 11. Cucullo (K.) }\end{gathered}$
$\Sigma_{\iota \kappa \epsilon \lambda i a}$ an old part of Tibur, Dion. Hal. 1. 9, cf. Siculi sub A, Kiep., Alte Geogr. p. 432.
Tolerienses Pl. 3. 5. 69, To $\boldsymbol{\lambda} \epsilon$ pìvoı Plut. Coriol. 28.5 perhaps $=$ Trebium (sup.) Liv. 2. 39.
Regillus lacus cl. e.g. Liv. 2. 19, but only as the site of the battle in 496 b.c., cf. Regillum 310 (Sabini) B.
Lepinus M. Colum. 10. 131. Lepíni M.
Cabenses sacerdotes (feriarum Latinarum) montis Albani insce. (-bienses Pl. 3. 5. 64, -ßâvoc Dion. Hal. 5. 61); cf. mod. Mônte Carvo (=Mons Albanus), v. Mom. Bull. Ins. Arch. Rom. 1861, p. 207, or Dessau ad C. I. L. xiv. 2228.
Baetterrae C. I. L. ix. 799.
*Afilae, -anus C. I. L. xiv. 3442, Pl. 3. 11. 105 (Alfell-) Lib. Col. I. p. 236 (Afile). Affile.

Querquetulani Plin. 3. 5. 69, Dion. Hal. 5. 61 (Kорккт-) of. Querquetulana porta under Rome Note xxxvii. 5 inf. ?Corcolle.
Ameriola Liv. 1. 38, Pl. 3 § 68.
Albŭnčae nemus Verg. Aen. 7. 81 al. Cf. Dessau C. I. L. xiv. pp. 435 and 368.
Fossa Cluilia Liv. e.g. 1. 23, -ae Cloeliae Paul. ex Fest. 56 Müll.
Arsia silva Liv. 2.7 al.
Maesia silva (Mess-, Mes- ?) Liv. 1. 33, Pl. 8 § 225.
Hĕlerni lucus, near Ostia, Ov. Fast. 2. 67, 6. 105.
Caruentana arx Liv. 22. 15 and 16; Steph. Byz. quotes a nom. -vros from Dion. Hal., but -en tum seems more probably the true form.
Cātilli mons Serv. ad Aen. 7.670 (Cātillus is cl. as the name of a man, Verg. 1.c. and Sil. ; Stat. has once Căt-; Hor. Od. 1. 18. 2 moenia Cātīli=Tibur).
$\left.\begin{array}{l}\text { Spino, -onis fl. } \\ \text { Nodinus fl. }\end{array}\right\}$ Cic. Nat. Deor. 3. 20 ad fin. 'in augurum precatione.'
*Retrices (only in abl. -cibus) Cato apud Fest. et Paul. p. 282-3 M., cf. p. 405 ; is it the name of a conduit used as a place-name?

## C. Doubtful.

Ilionenses Plin. 3. § $64=$ Laurolauinienses A sup., cf. Beloch Ital. Bund p. 14.
Puilia saxa Fest. 250 Müll.
Albiona, ager trans Tiberim dicitur a luco Albionarum quo loco bos alba sacrificabatur. Paul, ex Fest. 4 Müll.
Sulmo Pl. 3. 5. 68, Verg. Aen. 10. 517. ? Sermonéta.
Stephane, חo入vot'́фavos, said to be an older name of Praeneste (v. A supr.) Pl. 3. 5. 64, Stra. 5. 3. 11.

Cati fons and Aqua Petronia Paul. ex Fest. 45 Müll., and Fest. 250 Müll., Catialis collis Placid. p. 29 Deuerl.
$\Phi \hat{\eta} \sigma \tau 0 \iota$ Stra. 5. 3. 2, v. Henzen Act. Arval. p. 47.
Tifata Pl. 3. 5. 68, cf. 154 А, 205 в. 1. sup.
Fenectani campi Liv. 8. 12.
Sassula Liv. 7. 19.

Empulum Liv. 7. 18.
Amitinum Plin. 3. 5. 68, Ametini (? -rini) C. I. L. x. 6440.
$\Lambda a \beta a \nu a ̀ v ̈ \delta a \tau a$ Stra. 5. 3. 11.
Ager Turax and Ager Lutirius (Lit-, Lut-, Lincer- codd. ; is not Lucer- most probable?), Cato apud Macr. Sat. 1. 10.
Bubetani Pl.;3. 5. 69, -evzavoi Dion. Hal. 5. 61.
Foretii Pl. 3. 5. 69, ?=Фортиeío Dion. Hal. 5. 61.
Hortenses Pl. 3. 5. 69 al. Hortinae classes Verg. Aen. 7. 716.
Pirae? Plin. 3. 5. 59.
'E $\pi \in \iota \frac{1}{\text { í Dion. Hal. 2. 1, cf. Pauli Veneter p. } 230 .}$
Manates Pl. 3. 5. 69? cf. proper name Manatia Victorina Brambach, Corp. Inscc. Rhenan. 1767.
Roboraria near Tusculum, Itin. Anton. p. 305.
The following are only mentioned in Pliny (3. 5. 69) among the 'populi in monte Albano carnem accipere soliti,' who were extinct in his time.

Abolani, Accienses, Cusuetani, Macrales, Numinienses (al. Munienses), Octulani, Olliculani, Sisolenses, Tutienses, Vimitellarii, Velienses, Venetulani.
Corne a hill near Tusculum Plin. 16. § 242; ? cf. Columen Liv. 3. 23 in the same vicinity ('Diana Corria' Orell. 3539 is corrupt, v. id. 2909). חapcov́vıos? older name of the Anio Plut. Parallela 40.
Pomonal in agro Solonio Fest. p. 250 M .
इıy入ıoupía? Plut. Poplic. 16. 3.

## D. Further modern names.

Agosta, Gerano, Palombara Sabina, Ponza d'Archinazzo, Poli, Zagarolo, Frascati, Genazzano, Lunghezza, Villa Spada, Frattocchie, Pignataro.

## Note xxxvii. Ancient Place-Names in Rome.

The following are among the most ancient names of localities in Rome itself; those within the Pomerium are arranged according to the four Regiones of Servius.
Pōmērium cl. inscc., -moerium cl.

1. S. of the Pomerium.
$\left\{\begin{array}{l}\text { Mons Ăuentinus (-num), -nus (adj.) cl. inscc. } \\ \text { Murcus (an older name) Paul. ex F. } 148 \text { M., Serv. ad Aen. 8. } 636 .\end{array}\right.$
Publicius cliuos cl. e.g. Liv. 26. 10, 27. 37.
Sublĭcĭus pons cl. cf. sublices 254 sup.
Rĕmūrǐa, -rinus Ov. Foast. 5. 479 al., - $\mu \circ \rho$ - Dion. Hal. $-\mu \omega \rho$ - Plut. Rom.
2. 3. Cf. also Remona Paul. ex F. 276 M., $-\mu \omega_{\nu}{ }^{\prime} \boldsymbol{\nu}$ Plut. Fort. Rom.
9.7, who gives ' $\mathrm{P} \hat{\omega} \mu \mathrm{os}$ as the original name and ' $\mathrm{P} \iota \gamma \nu$ ápıov as the name in his own ( $\nu \hat{\nu} \nu \delta \hat{\epsilon}$ ) day.
Clivus Publicius cl.
Porta Trigemı̌na cl.
Stĭmŭlae lucus in Aventino. cl. e.g. Ov. Fast. 6. 497, identified with Semele (form Simila Liv. 39. 12).
Porta Raudusculana Var. L. L. 5. 163 al., cf. p. 271 f. sup.
Porta Lauernalis id. 5. 136, and Paul. ex F. 117 M.
Porta Minutia? Fest. 122 and 147 M.

## 2. Regio Palatina.

Pălātĭum, -tinus and the mythical Pallantēum cl. Tribus Palatina, Mons Palatinus, cl. insce.
Lŭpercal, a cave beneath the Palatine cl. e.g. Verg. Aen. 8. 342.
Murcĭa uallis, Venus Murcia cl. e.g. Fest. 148 M. (Murtea Varro L. L. 5 § 154 Speng.).

Germalus cl., e.g. Var. L. L. 5. 54, Liv. 33. 26.
Velia Var. L. L. 5. 64, Fest. 348 M.
Rūmōn an ancient name of the Tiber, Serv. ad Aen. 8. 63 and 90.
Ruminalis ficus cl. e.g. Liv. 1. 4; dea Rumina Var. R. R. 2. 11 (Rūmĭna Ov. Fast. 2. 412).

Sacra Via el. inscc.
Vēlābrum (maius and minus), -brensis cl.
Curia Călābra cl.
Forum Bŏārĭum cl.
Vicus Iŭgārĭus cl.
Vicus Tuscus cl.
Vicus Cyprius Liv. 1. 48, Cip-Var. L. L. 5.32 and 159 ( 309 D inf.).
Lacus Curtius in foro cl.
Mundus, Manalis lapis in Comitio Varro ap. Macrob. Sat. 1. 16, Fest. p. 154 M.
Sacellum Streniae Var. L. L. 5. 47, Fest. 293 M. al.
Iūturnae fons el. e.g. Ov. Fast. 1. 705.
Argīlētum, -tanus cl. v. Keller, Lat. Volksetym. p. 23 f.
Argēī cl. e.g. Liv. 1. 21, Var. L. L. 5. 45.
Roma Quadrata on the Palatine Fest. 258 M. al.
Porta Romanula Var. L. L. 5. 164 (Romana Fest.) cf. 309 a inf.
Porta Mugionis Non. 531 Merc., Muc- Var. L. L. 5. 164, -gionia Paul. ex F. 144 M. -gonia Solin. 1. 24.
Porta Ianualis Var. L. L. 5. 164, Macr. Sat. 1. 9.
Porta Flumentana ${ }^{1}$ cl.
Porta Carmentalis cl. (cf. lex Carmentis, or - ta).
Porta Ferentina? Plut. Fort. Rom. 20.
Porta Piacularis? Fest. 213 M.
Pectuscum Palati Fest. 213 M.
Doliola ad Cluacam Maximam, cl. e.g. Var. L. L. 5. 157.
Lautolae Var. L. L. 6. 156, Serv. ad Aen. 8. 361.
Vacci prata Liv. 8. 19.

[^83]
## 3. W. of the Pomerium.

Aequimaelium, -ius uicus cl. e.g. Liv. 4. 16.
(Căpĭtōlĭum, Mons Capitolinus cl. inscc.
Tarpeiius mons, -ium saxum, -ia arx, cl.
Saturnius mons, -ia porta (=the following) Var. L. L. 5. 42.
Porta Pandana Paul. ex F. 220 M., Solin. 1. 13.
Scalae Gemoniae cl.
Tepula aqua in Capitolio Plin. 36 § 121. Frontin. Aequaed. c. 8.
Lautŭmĭae cl. e.g. Liv. 26. 27, 39. 44 (-tumia sing. Var. L. L. 5. 151).

Prata Quinctia trans Tiberim Paul. ex F. 256 M.
Petelinus lucus Liv. 6. 20, 7. 41, by some doubtfully identified with Poetelius lucus on the Esquiline.
Campus (Martĭus) cl. inscc.
Ovile in Campo Liv. 26. 22, Serv. ad Ecl. 1. 34.
Caprae or Caprea palus in Campo cl. e.g. Liv. 1. 16.
Těrentum, -e(n)tinus cl. Tribus Tere(n)tina cl. inscc. which
Fest. however, p. 363, derives 'a flumine Terede' (? legendum Terente, v. Serv. ad Aen. 8. 63, who gives Terentum (from tero) as an old name of the Tiber), see Liv. 10. 9.
Serra a religious name for the Tiber, Serv. ad Aen. 8. 63.
Iānı̆cŏlum (-cul-) -lensis cl. inscc. Plin. 3. § 68 gives Antipolis as its more ancient name. M. Gianicolo.

## 4. Regio Collina.

Collina porta, Tribus cl. inscc.
Sceleratus campus, uicus cl.
Lautulae Var. L. L. 5. 166, locus Lautulus Serv. ad Aen. 8. 361.
Vātīcānus collis, ager cl. (-tĭc- Hor. Od. 1. 20. 7).
Latiaris collis cl.
Mucialis collis Var. L. L. 5. 52.
Quy̆rīnālis collis cl., porta. Fest. 255 M . Tribus Quǐrīna cl. inscc. (which however Fest. 263 M. derives 'a Curensibus Sabinis' v. Liv. Epit. 19) and 309 a inf. s.v. curis. Cf. Quiritium fossae Liv. 1. 33 al.

Vïmĭnālis collis, porta cl. (cf. Plin. 16.37).

Ratumenna porta Plin. 8. 161, Fest. 274 M., - manna Solin. 45. 15. Fontinalis porta cl. (e.g. Liv. 35. 10) insc.
Sanqualis porta Fest. 343 M., auis cl., cf. 309 A inf. s.v. Sancus.

## 5. Regio Esquilina.

Esquîlĭae, -linus -lina Tribus cl. inscc. (also Aes-, not in inscc., v. Mommsen Abhandl. d. Berl. Akad. 1868 p. 172, and Keller, Lat. Volksetym. p. 22).
Caelĭus mons cl. inscc.
Querquetulanus (the older name) Tac. Ann. 4. 65, ef. Querquetulani Note exxvi. (Latini) B., and
Querquetulana (also -aria) porta cl., by some identified with
Caelimontana porta cl.
Caeliolus (a branch of M. Caelius) Var. L. L. 5. 46, -liculus Cic. Har. Resp. § 32.
Cispius mons (part of the Esquiline) Fest. 340 M. al. (Cesp- Var. L. L. 5. 50).

Oppius mons (another part) Var. and Fest. 11.c.
Poetelius lucus Varro L. L. 5. §501.
Fagutalis lucus Var. L. L. 5.49 (? lacus Solin. 1. 26); Jupiter Fagutalis Plin. 16. 37; -tal neut. Fest. p. 340 M.
Orbius cliuus Dion. Hal. 4. 39, Urb- Liv. 1. 48 all., cf. Müll. ad Fest. p. 182.

Corneta at the foot of the Esquiline, Varro L. L. 5. §§ 146 and 152.

## 6. Regio Suburana.

Sŭbūra (-urra), -ranus cl.
Vicus Sucusanus (sic legendum) Var. L. L. 5. 48, Fest. 309 M. In insec. we have always Tribus SUC. $=$ Tribus Suburrana, e.g. C. I. L. xiv. 397, Momm. Röm. Trib. p. 82 al. (Succ. only in a forged insc. ib. p. 77 n .), cf. Quint. 1. 7. $29^{2}$.

[^84]Cărīnae cl.
Ceroliensis

Lucus Mefitis id. ib. § 48, also Fest. 351 M.
Vicus Instelanus id. ib. § 52, cf. Jordan Topogr. 2. 242, 263.
Porta Căpēna cl.
Turris Mamilia Paul. ex Fest. p. 131 M. and insc., Bull. Arch. Com. 1888 p. 398.

Tribus Lemonia cl. inscc. 'a pago Lemonio quiest a porta Capena via Latina,' Paul. 113 M., cf. Pauli Veneter p. 427.
For Septimontium=the Palatium, Germalus, Velia, Fagutal, Oppius, Cispius, Caelius (cl. e.g. Varr. L. L. 5. 41), v. Dict. Geogr. s.v. Roma p. 734, and Kiep. Alte Geogr. p. 421.

## 7. Names not locally identified.

## Clitellae Paul. ex F. 59 M.

Insteius uicus Liv. 24. 10 (ef. gens Insteia cl. and ? Instelanus uicus sup.).
Fenestella porta Ov. Fast. 6. 578, Plut. Qu. Rom. c. 36, Plut. de Fort. Rom. 10, hence the cognomen of the well-known Augustan writer, and the gens Fenestellia C. I. L. v. 4941.
Portunium, a flower and garland market, Fronto ad M. Caes. 1. 7 p. 19 Naber.

The names of the three most ancient tribes and of the corresponding centuries of knights :
Lŭcěres, -re(n)ses ( $-\bar{u}-\bar{O}_{\mathrm{V}}$., -ŭ- Propert.) cl. e.g. Varro L. L. 5.55 and 81 .
Ramnes, -nenses cl. e.g. Varro l.c., -netes late.
Titienses cl. e.g. Varro 5. 55, 89, 91, and in sing. Titiensis (except Titiens Prop. 5. 1. 31); a gen. pl. Titium appears in Varro 5. 81. The form Tatienses seems now generally abandoned by editors; sodales Titienses, a priestly college, insce.

## Note xxxviii. Personal Names ${ }^{1}$ of the Latini ${ }^{2}$.

|  | A. Frequent. |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1. Nomina. |  |
| gens Acilia | Cacia | Dupilia |
| Aebutia | Caecilia | Egnatia inf. |
| Aelia | Caelia inf. | Egrilia (rarely Aeg-) |
| Aemilia | Cerellia (Caer-) | Fahia |
| Agria | Caesellia | Faenia |
| Albia | Caesennia | Fiseuia |
| Allia inf. | Caesia | Flauia |
| Annia | Caesonia | Folia |
| Antistia (twice -test-) | Caesonia | Fonteia |
| Antonia | Calpurnia | Fregania (Fraeg-) |
| Appuleia (less often | Caltilia | Fuluia |
| Apu-, three times | Caninia | Furia |
| Apu-, three times with -11-, once | Carminia | Gauia inf. |
| Apoll-) | Cartilia | Gellia |
| Aquillia (less often | Casperia <br> Cassia | Geminia |
| -ilia-) | Cestia | Grania |
| Arellia (once -elia) | Cincia | Hateria (also At-) |
| Arria | Cipia inf. | Heluia inf. <br> Hereia |
| Arruntia (less often | Claudia | Herennia (once-enia) |
| Aru-) inf. | Clodia |  |
| Artoria | Cloelia inf. | Herennuleia (less |
| Atia | Cocceia | often -enu-) |
| Atilia | Coelia | Horatia |
| Attia | Combarisia | Hortensia (-esia) |
| Aufidia | Cominia inf. | Hostilia |
| Aufia | Cornelia | Humania $l$. |
| Aurelia | Critonia | Iulia |
| Axilia (Axs- Acs-) | Curtia | Iunia inf. |
| Baberia | Cutia | Iuuentia |
| Bebia | Decimia (once -cem-) | Laberia, |
| Bellicia | inf. | Laelia |
| Bruttia (once Bryttia) | Domitia | Licinia (once Leic-) |

${ }^{1}$ For the arrangement and notation see the list of Signs and Abbreviations. Here, as in the other lists of names, the underlinings denote non-Latin, or possibly non-Latin characteristics.
${ }^{2}$ From C. I. L. xiv., excluding the Praeneste-Tusculum district (307 sup.), and also omitting 4074-88 and 4278.


## 2. Among the Cognomina may be mentioned

| Bassus | Musa | Rufinus |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Cerdo | Plarianus | Rufus |
| Ianuarius | Pollio (once Polio) | Saluius |
| Maro (twice -on) | Proculus (-cl-) |  |

B. Less frequent.

1. Nomina.
gens Abenia (one insc.)
Accoleia (-cul-')
Acerra
Aeficia
Afilana (one insc.)
Afinia (one inse.)
Afrania
Agilleia
Ailia
Aleia
Alfia
Allidia (once -ed-)
Alliena
Amatia
Anicia
Aninia
Annea
Anteia
Antia
Apertia
Arbustia
Aristia
Arrania
Arrecina
Asicia
Asinia
Attiena l. (one insc.)
Auchenia
Aufestia
Auiania
Auidia
Auienia (one insc.)
Auonia
Autronia
Baebutia
Bellenia
Berbucia
Brittia
Caicia (Caec-)

Caesilia
Caetrania (one insc.)
Caetronia (one insc.)
Calauia (oneinsc.)inf
Calpetana
Caluisia
Cauuleia
Capia
Captia (one insc.)
Cartia (one inso.)
Caruilia
Carullia
Castricia inf.
Catia (one insc.)
Catilia (one insc.)
Catinia (one insc.)
Cattia
Cauaria
Cauia (one insc.)
Caulia
Cauponia (Cop-)
Celeria
Ceruia
Cluentia (once Clou-)
Cluuia
Codonia
Consia
Considia
Cordia
Cosidia
Cossinia
Cossutia
Crepereia
Culciscia
Curia
Cuspia
Dastidia
Dasumia (once -sim-)
Decia
Deciria

Detelia
Dissenia
Domatia
Duronia (one insc.)
Eggia
Ennia
Eruciana
Fabricia (-rec-)
Fadia
Fracenia
Faltonia l. (one insc.)
Fannia (once Fania)
Ferrania
Firmania
Firmia
Flauina
Floria
Fuficia (once -feic-)
Fundania
Fundilia
Futia
Gabinia
Galeria
Gargilia
Gentia (one insc.)
Genucia (once -ic- on
same insc. as -uc-)
Gepidia
Gessia (once Gesia)
Gettia
Graecia
Graecinia (one insc.)
Grattia (once -atia)

## Hedia

Heria
Hordionia
Hostia
Iauolena
Istoria
Iustia

| Laecania | Oclatia | Saluia |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Laeuia | Ofillia | Saluidena |
| Leuonica (thrice in | Olia | Saluidiena ${ }^{\text {onceeach }}$ |
| one inse.; once else- | Oppia inf. | Sattia |
| where Laeu-) | Ouinia | Saufeia inf.? |
| Lappia | Paconia | Seculia (-gul-) |
| Larcia | Palaa | Selicia |
| Lartia | Pantuleia | Senatia |
| Lartidia | Papia inf. | Sertoria |
| Lasuccia | Papinia | Sestia |
| Liguria | Papiria | $\overline{\text { Setina }}$ |
| Longinia | Patria | Setoria |
| Lucia inf. | Pedania | Seueria |
| Lusia | Pedia | Sirtia |
| Lutatia | Peducaea | Spuria inf.? |
| Luttia | Perperna vir | Staberia |
| Macrinia | Perpernnia mul. l. | Statia inf. |
| Maecenatia | Pescennia once each | Steia |
| Maecilia | Pescenia $\}$ | Stertinia |
| Maeclasia | Peticia inf. | Stlaccia |
| Maelia | Petreia | Suestidia |
| Maenia | Pilia | Sulfia |
| Magia | Pinaria | Sullia (once Syllia) |
| Magnia | Pinnia | Tadia |
| Mallia | Pipidia (one insc.) | Tarusia |
| Mantennia (once, and | Pirria (one insc.) | Tettia |
| once -enia) | Plaetoria | Thoria |
| Marria | Plinia | Tiburtia |
| Martia | Plutia | Tillia |
| Masuria | Poppaea (once -ea) <br> Postumi | Tineia (once -nia) |
| Matuccia | Postumulena | Tinucia |
| Messenia | Prifernia | Titienia |
| Meuia | Prifernia | Titinia |
| Minatia inf. | Publisidia | Tongilia |
| Minidia | Pullia | Tonia |
| Modestia | Raecia | Trebellia |
| Mollicia | $\underline{\text { Rammia }}$ | Trebia inf. |
| Mummia (once-umia) | Rasia | Turcia (one insc.) |
| Munatuleia(oneinsc.) | Rennia | Turellia |
| Mundicia | Rocia | Turpilia |
| Munia | Romania | Tutilia |
| Murdia | Rubellia | Varenia |
| Nera[t]ia |  | Vargunteia |
| Nouellia <br> Obellia (-elia, once | Sallia | Varinia |
| Obellia (-elia, once | Salluuia (Gr. $\Sigma \alpha \lambda$ - | Vatronia |
| each) inf. | $\lambda$ oúlos) | Vennonia |

xxxviii C PERSONAL NAMES OF THE LATINI.

| Ventilia | $\frac{\text { Vettulena }}{\text { Vetu-) }}$ (twice | Vmbilia |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Venuleia | Vmbria (once -eia) |  |
| Vestilia | Vibullia | Voluseia |
| Vestricia inf. | Vibusia (once -ussia) | Vttedia (once Uttie-) |
| Vetilia | Villia |  |

Agrippinus
Ammia
Antullus
Anullinus
Apella
Blaesus
Bonosa
Camillus
Cerialis
Corinthus
2. Among the Cognomina.

| Damas (once -ma) <br> Gaius <br> Hirrutus | Rebilus <br> Maius |
| :--- | :--- |
| Rosianus |  |

C. Once only.

1. Nomina.

| Anilia | Aufustia |
| :--- | :--- |
| Annidia | Augustalia |
| Annio[1]ena | Auiena |
| Antilia | Auillia |
| Api[c]ia | Aulia |
| Apidia | Auscia? |
| Aponia | Auteia? |
| Appaenia | Badusia |
| Aprofin[ia] | Baedia |
| Apronia | Balbilia |
| Apusalenia | Bania |
| Aricinia? | Bassilia |
| Arpagia | Beritia? |
| Arrena | Betrina |
| Ateia | Bisinia |
| Atidia | Blossia inf. |
| Atilena | Bolana |
| Attennia | Bombia |
| Aufia |  |


| Brenia | Donatia | Istilia? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Britidia | Donnia | Iustuleia |
| Brotia | Ducenia | Labiena |
| Bullatia | Durdenia | Laetoria |
| Buria | Durmia | Lalia |
| [C]aedicia | Equitia | Lania |
| Caepia | Ereleia | Largia |
| Caesernia | Ernuleia | Laricia |
| Caesetia | [E]rucia | Latinia |
| Caetennia | Etrilia | Legaria |
| Caetennia | Faberia | Lepidia |
| Caledia | Faia[nia] | Litoria |
| Calestria | Farrania | Longidia |
| Caluentia | Farria | Loreia |
| Caluia | Fausi.... | Lorenia |
| Caluidia | Feridia | Lorentia |
| Cameria $l$. | Fescenna vir | Luccia |
| Campania | Fescennia mul. $t$. | Lumbia |
| Camu | Fictoria | Macedina |
| Canusia | Firmiana | Macia |
| Carantia | Flaminia | Magilia |
| Carfia | Forbeia | Magutt[ia] |
| Carinatia | Fuficulena | Mania |
| Carisia | Fufidia | Manneia |
| Carpitana | Fulc[inia]? | Marracia |
| Cartoria | Fullonia | Matia |
| Carutia | Fultia | Meclonia |
| Cascellia | Funisulana | Mercella |
| Caticania | Furnia | Mesulena |
| Ceionia | Fusinia | Mezaea |
| Ciarcia | Galedia | Mimisia |
| Cilnia | Genatia | Minasia |
| Cirria | Gerulana | Montania |
| Cispia | Gerusia | Munnenia |
| Cluturia | Gesatia | Musamia |
| Cocilia | Gordia | Mutilia |
| Comica | Gypsani[a] | Muttia |
| Connia | Heiulia | Nammia |
| Cosconia | Helfinia | [Nor]bana |
| Crispia | Hellenia | Numidia |
| Crispina | Heluidia | Nummia |
| Critaria | Hoenia | Nunnidia |
| Cuperia | Honeria | Nunnuleia |
| Curiatial. | [H]osidia inf. | Nymphidia |
| Curtilia | Iegia inf.? | Obulnia |
| Diuilia | Insteia | Oclatin[i]a |


| Opel[lia] | Rufia | Tribellia |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Opimia | Rufria | Turia |
| Oppuneia | Rusticania | Turrenia |
| Orfia | Sabinia | Tusculania |
| Orfita | Sacconia | Tussania |
| Ouilia | Saenia | Tutia |
| Pacceia | Safinia inf. | Tyria |
| Pacedia | $\overline{\text { Salania }}$ | Vadia |
| Pacia inf. | Satellia | Valgia |
| Pacxea? | Satellia | Vannia |
| Paquedia | Scaudia | Varronia |
| Pelagi[nia] | Scifonia | Vatinia |
| Perellia | Scuppidia | Vcena? |
| Perennia | Sellia | Vehilia |
| Perternia | Seppia | Veiena |
| Petilia | Sercudia | Velleia |
| Petisia | Serenia | Vellenia |
| Placentia | Seria | Vennia |
| Plausurnia | Sestidia | Vernia |
| Plotidia | Sicinia | [V]erulana |
| Pompusia | Sidonia | Vespria |
| $\overline{\text { Poppidia }}$ | Siluania | Vettenia (once |
| Portumia | Simplicia | -ennia) |
| Precilia | Spedia inf. | Vetticia |
| Procilia | Spelia | Vettiena |
| Proculeia | Spurillia | Vetulania |
| Publeia | Staedia inf. | Vibenna |
| Publia | Staia inf. | Vibrent. |
| Pulfatia | Stateria | [V]iciria |
| Pullaenia | Sterceia | Vincia |
| Pumidia | Subria | Vinia |
| Pupiena | Sunturia | Vinicia inf. |
| Pupilia | Tamulia | $\overline{\text { Virgil[i]a }}$ |
| Quadronia | Tannia | Vitellia |
| Rabir[ia] | Tannonia | Viuellia |
| Rabonia | [T]arquiti[a] | Vmbricia |
| Rabul[e]ia | Tarrut[enia] | Vmbricia |
| Ramennia | Tedia | Vmennia |
| Rapellia | Tenneia (dative) | Vmidia |
| Rapidia | Te[t]tedia? | Volceia |
| Kapurnia | Thurania | Volcacia (Vulkac-) |
| Rasticania | Tinia | Voluntilia |
| Refriu.... | Titaedia | Volussiana |
| Reptinea | Torquatia | Vonbia |
| Ricinia | Traiana | Vrbatia |
| Ridania | Trebatia | Vrfi... |
| Rubrinia | Trebiena | Vuotidia? |

## 2. Among the Cognomina.

| Abinnaeus | Furnius | Pisibanus |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Aciua | Gates $l$. | Quetus |
| Affia | Hamillus | Rebennius |
| Afias | Hosia | Reburrus |
| Aglinus | Lada | Rufio |
| Aprilla | Laurus | Sarnia |
| Ascula | Lausus | Scapula |
| Baricio | Ligus | Silo |
| Betoretus | Lusario | Sosianus |
| Bouius | Malia | Sossianus |
| Burria vir | Masila | Sosus |
| Caesime | Matidia | Ispes |
| Callo mul. | Mininnus agn. | Spesina |
| Callon vir | Nasica | Stloga |
|  | Naso | Istratonice |
| Coeranus | Nonnus agn. | Tata |
| Dasius | October | Tatias |
| Dassius | Ofellio | Tussania |
| Decria inf. | Paelignianus | Vecula |
| Drauce | Paetinus | Venula |
| Drosus | Pandusa | Volusenus |
| Eglectus | Papia | Vrsulus |
| Faentina(i.e.Fauen-) | Peplus |  |

## E. Sabini.

No inscriptions in this dialect remain to us, and Mommsen (U.D. p. 348 n.), following Niebuhr, points out that all the forms quoted as Sabine by ancient writers have Latin terminations, so that the dialect must have been completely merged in Latin before the time of Varro. Moreover both Varro and Festus, while regularly citing lingua Osca, do not speak of lingua Sabina but simply of Sabini; there are two exceptions in Varro, see inf. s.v. Sancus and Note xxxix $a$, neither however in such a context as to imply a living language. This early disappearance of the native dialect is accounted for by the history of the tribe. The whole Sabine territory was taken into Roman occupation early in the third century B.C., after its subjugation by M'. Curius Dentatus in 290 (Florus 1. 10 Bellum Sabinum, cf. Plin. 18. 3. 18 etc.). In the same year according to Velleius (1.14.6) it received the civitas sine suffragio, which (id. 1. 14.7) was converted into the full franchise in 268 . About 240 b.C. (Liv. Epit. 19) the tribus Quirina was established, which, as we know from inscc., embraced all the Sabine communities, including even Amiternum. For further details see Mommsen C. I. L. IX. p. 396, Beloch It. Bd. p. 31 f., 51 f.

Some local peculiarities, however, are suggested by Quint. 1.5.56; Taceo de Tuscis et Sabinis et Praenestinis quoque, nam, ut eorum sermonem utentem, Vectium Lucilius insectatur, quemadmodum Pollio deprehendit in Liuio Patauinitatem: if eorum here refers to any one but the Praenestini, this later Sabine patois must have been marked enough in the time of Lucilius for him to profess to recognise it. This is not saying very much, especially if, as Quintilian suggests, Vectius' Latin was in point of purity no worse than Livy's.

## 309 Sabine Glosses.

## A. Well attested.

## alpo- 'albus,' Alpes,

Paul. ex F. 4 M. Album quod nos dicimus a Graeco quod est à $\lambda \phi \partial{ }_{\partial}$ appellatum [cf. Hesych. s.v.]; Sabini tamen alpum dixerunt. Unde credi potest nomen Alpium a candore niuium uocitatum. The word is clearly
 would be *alfo-. For the spread of a geographical name ef. Italia ( 11 A sup.).

## auso- 'aurum.'

Paul. ex F. 9 M. Aurum...alii a Sabinis quod illi ausum dicebant. Compare also a vexatiously abridged gloss, id. 23 M . Aureliam familiam ex Sabinis oriundam a Sole dictum putant, quod ei publice a populo Romano datus sit locus in quo sacra faceret Soli, qui ex hoc Auseli dicebantur ut Valesii, Papisii pro eo quod est Valerii, Papirii. It does not appear what the connexion was that Festus supposed between Auselio- and sol. The name was compared by Mom. U. D. p. 349 with aủk $\lambda \omega \omega$ ( (धेs únd Tupp. Hesych.), which he would correct to aưon่र, quoting usil from two Etr. bronzes (Bull. Ins. Arch. 1840 p. 11, Gerhard Arch. Zeit. 1847, Anh. 1. p. 9), where it appears to designate the sun-god and a goddess (Aurora?) respectively. If so it is no doubt a Sabine word borrowed.
casco- 'uetus.'
Varro L.L. 7. 28. In carmine Priami quod est: Casmenas cascam rem uolo profarier, primum Cascum significat uetus; secundo eius origo Sabina, quae usque radices in Oscam linguam egit. Varro adds other passages from Ennius, Manilius and Papirius showing the same sense; cf. also 205 A, sup. s.v. casno-,
cato- 'acutus.'
Varro L.L. 7. 46. Cata acuta, hoc enim uerbo dicunt Sabini.

## cesna 'cena.'

Paul. ex F. 338 M., and fragm. Fest. 339 M. Scensas Sabini cenas dicebant. Quae autem nunc prandia sunt cenas dicebant, et pro cenis uespernas appellabant. But id. 209 M. s.v. Pennas gives the form as cesnas, which Osc. kerssna-shows to be correct.
crepero- 'dubius,' crepusco- 'crepusculo natus.'
Varro L. L. 6. 5. Crepusculum sumpserunt a Sabinis, unde ueniunt Crepusci nominati Amiterno qui eo tempore erant nati, ut Lucii prima luce in Reatino: crepusculum significat dubium; ab eo res dictae dubiae creperae. Similarly in 7. 77, and Paul. ex F. 52 and 71 M. and Non. 13 Merc. Observe that the adj. need not be derived from the -es- : -os- stem; if it be, we have it in a Latinised form (= pure Sab. *crepeso-?).

## cumba 'lectica.'

Paul. ex F. 64 M . Cumbam Sabini uocant eam quam militares lecticam unde uidetur deriuatum esse cubiculum.

## cupenco- 'sacerdos.'

Serv. ad Aen. 12. 538 (nec di texere Cupencum). Sane sciendum cupencum Sabinorum lingua sacerdotem uocari. Ibid. (Dan.). Sunt autem cupenci Herculis sacerdoter,

## curis 'hasta,' Juno Curitis ; compare the Sabine town Cures (310 A inf.)

 and perhaps also Lat. Quürinus, Tribus Quirina, Quŭrites.Ovid, Fasti 2. 475, Proxima lux uacua est: at tertia dicta Quirino. Qui tenet hoc nomen Romulus ante fuit, Siue, quod hasta curis priscis est dicta Sabinis, Bellieus a telo uenit in astra deus;
Siue suo regi nomen posuere Quirites; Seu quia Romanis iunxerat ille Cures.

These three derivations reappear in various authorities, and all appear to be based on a passage in Varro 'libro V Rerum Diuinarun,' (Macrob. 1. 9. 16); but in L. L. 5. 73 he says simply 'Quirinus $\begin{aligned} & \text { © Quiritibus.' }\end{aligned}$
(1) and (2) are united by Paul. ex F. 49 M., who gives also (3) and repeats it at 67 M .; at 63 M. s.v. caelibari he gives: (quia) matronae Iunonis Curitis in tutela sint, quae ita appellabatur a ferenda hasta quae lingua Sabinorum Curis dicitur, and similarly on p. 49. Macrob. l.c. gives only (1); Serv. ad Aen. 1. 292 gives (1), but ad Aen. 7. 710 he follows Liv. 1. 13. 5 in uniting (2) and (3) and not mentioning (1). Dion. Hal. 2. 48 (to whom of course Quirinus is Kvpivos), quoting Varro, derives Cures either from Quirinus or from curis, kúpets


 doubt that the tribus Quirina was formed at Rome expressly to include the people of Cures and the surrounding country (v. sup. p. 351), but this official act of nomenclature may be variously explained, and in no case, so far as I can see, can any certain phonetic deduction be based upon it.

The form 'quiris'= spear does not appear till Isidore (9.2.84) and is therefora probably an invention.

From all this it seems at least clear
(a) that only forms with Cur- are Sabine ${ }^{1}$,
( $\beta$ ) that only forms with Qưrr- are Latin (Gr. K $v \rho$ - is indifferent).
1 ' It is just worth considering whether Sabine cǔ- may not, under some conditions, have had the sound kiil ( $=$ Attic $\kappa v$ ), which approximates closely to that of Lat. quĭ-.' J. P. P.

I know of no other evidence to decide whether qui- became cu- in Sabine, a possibility which derivations (1) and (3) assume. 'Spearmen' is a good enough meaning for Quirites, for the later nse of the word='civilian' may have been developed by its survival as a traditional name for the members of the originally military Comitia Centuriata. If the word comes from (an older form of) Cures, then for the ending compare Caer-ites. (Corssen's deriv. from cūria is impossible.)

I do not know whether the form curin (quam Sabini curin uocant Macrob. l.c.) is meant to imply an $-n$ - stem (gen. nis etc.) and so explain the $-n$ - of the derivative Quirin-us.
fasena (-ana MS.) 'harena.'
Varro fragm. 58 Willmanns; Harena, ut testis est Varro, a Sabinis fasana dicitur; from Vel. Long. De Orth. p. 2230 Putsch.

The Sabine $f-$ and -8- may be allowed to substantiate the rather doubtful text.
februo- 'purgamentum.'
Varro L. L. 6. 13. Februum Sabini purgamentum et id in nostris sacris uerbum; nam et Lupercalia Februatio. For the Lat. februa, februatus, Februarius etc., see the whole passage in Varro, Ov. Fasti e.g. 2. 19, and the Lexica.

I do not know how much reliance can be placed on the terms of a statement

 $\epsilon \pi \star \delta \delta \sigma \epsilon \omega \mathrm{s} \tau \hat{\nu} \nu \kappa a \rho \pi \omega \hat{\nu}$.
fedo- 'haedus.'
Varro L. L.5.97. Quod illic (=apud Sabinos) fedus in Latio rure edus, qui in urbe, ut in multis, $a$ addito aedus. Paul. ex F. 84 M . Fedum antiqui dicebant pro hedo, folus pro olere, fostim pro hoste, fostiam pro hostia. Vel. Long. p. 2230 Putsch. F in uicinam aspirationem mutatur...ergo et hoedos [lege haed-] dicimus cum aspiratione quoniam foedi [lege fa-] dicebantur apud antiquos. Item hircos quoniam eosdem aeque fircos dicebant. Nam et e contrario quam antiqui habam dicebant nos fabam dicimus. (As to this see 349 A. Rem.) I conjecture that the true Sab. form was ${ }^{*}$ felo- (v. Idg. Forsch. Ir. p. 161), and either Varro's text or (more probably) his knowledge is at fault, and that Festus, as so often, has simply borrowed from him. Compare firco-.

## firco- 'hircus.'

Varro ib. Ircus quod Sabini fircus, and so Vel. Long. ib., ef. Fircellius Pauo Reatinus 311 C. 1 a. inf.

Feronia a Sabine (but not Oscan) deity.
C. I. L. Ix. e.g. $4873-5$ (from Trebula Mutuesca), but not in any inse. from Campania or Samnium, though Serv. Aen. 7.799 calls her 'nympha Campaniae,' says she was worshipped near Tarracina and identifies her with Iuno Virgo. She had also $■$ celebrated temple somewhere in Faliscan territory, v. pp. 370, 388 inf. Varro L. L. 5. 74, Feronia, Minerva, Nouensides ${ }^{-}$Sabinis.

## hernae 'saxa.'

Serv. ad Aen. 7. 684. Sabinorum lingua saxa hernae uocantur; adding that the Hernici were 5 Sabine tribe; which may be true, though the earlier Schol. Veron. ad loc., followed by Paul. ex F. 100 M., gives the word to the Marsi only, adding that in the (Hernican) Anagnia dwelt 'Marsorum coloni.' Paulus gives the word in the form herna (neut. pl.).

## idus 'idus,' cf:'Osc. eidů-.

Varro L. L. 6. 28. Idus ab eo quod Tusci itus uel potius quod Sabini idus dicunt.
lepesta 'uas uinarium (sacrum).'
Varro L. L. 5. 123. Item dictae lepestae quae etiam nunc in diebus sacris Sabinis uasa uinaria in mensa deorum sunt posita ; apud antiquos seriptores Graecos inueni appellari poculi genus $\delta \epsilon \pi \epsilon \in \sigma \tau a \nu$; quare uel inde radices in agrum Sa binum et Romanum sunt profectae. Id. Vit. Pop. Rom. ap. Schol. ad Verg. Ecl. 7. 33 and Prisc. 6. 15 p. 714 Putsch : Lepestam dicebant ubi erat uinum in mensa positum, aut galeolam, aut sinum : tria enim haec similia sunt, pro quibus nunc acratophoron ponitur. Id. ap. Non. 547 Merc. Lepistae etiam nunc Sabinorum fanis pauperioribus plerisque aut fictiles sunt aut aeneae. Paul. ex F. 113 M. Lepista genus uasis aquarii.

In Idg. Forsch. II. p. 161 I accepted Varro's derivation, although $\delta \epsilon \pi \epsilon \sigma \tau a \nu$ is not found in Greek, the nearest form being $\delta \epsilon \pi \pi a \sigma \tau \rho o v$. But the word $\lambda_{\epsilon \pi a \sigma \tau \dot{n}}-\alpha \sigma \tau l$ denotes ■ limpet-shaped drinking-cup which, according to Böckh, was used somewhere as a measure of capacity, C. I. G. 8346 (on a vase 'incerti loci'). It seems more reasonable therefore to connect the Sabine word with this, whether or not we put $\wedge$ for $\triangle$ in Varro's text, with Müller), although I regard the change of $d$ to $l$ as established for Sabine, v. inf. B. 2.

## lixulae 'round cakes,' similixulae (? sem-).

Varro L. L. 5. 107. Hos (i.e. circulos) quidam qui magis incondite faciebant uocabant lixulas et similixulas uocabulo Sabino, itaque frequentantur - Sabinis.

I hardly think the form simi- could be safely explained by the Osc. change of $\bar{e}$ to $\bar{i}$, since Auseli, nerienem, strena (inf.), all seem to show an $\bar{e}$ preserved in Sabine. [ $e$ and $i$ are very frequently confused in Lat. MSS. J. P. P.]
reloqui, eloqui 'responsa dare.'
Varro L. L. 6. 57. Loqui a loco ['] ...hine dicuntur eloqui ac reloqui in fanis Sabinis e cella dei qui loquuntur.
lucii 'prima luce nati,' in Reatino.
Varro L. L. 6. 5, quoted in full supra s.v. crepero-. So Paul. ex F. 119, (though the gloss contains a scarcely intelligible addition, perhaps due to some misunderstanding of Festus).

$$
23-2
$$

Mamers 'Mars,' see the same word p. 219 supr.
Varro L.L. 5. 73. Mars ab eo quod...aut quod Sabinis acceptus ibi est Mamers.
' Martis mensis' was fourth in the year among the Sabines, Ov. Fast. 3. 94 (ubi cf. v. 95 et lege turba Curensis, pace Merkelii; 'Forensis' (a Foruli) ignotum est): I quote the passage at length, for reference elsewhere.

85 Mars Latio venerandus erat, quia praesidet armis. Arma ferae genti remque decusque dabant. Quodsi forte uacas peregrinos inspice fastos; Mensis in his etiam nomine Martis erit.
Tertius Albanis, quintus fuit ille Faliscis; Sextus apud populos, Hernica terra, tuos. Inter Aricinos Albanaque tempora constat, Factaque Telegoni moenia celsa manu. Quintum Laurentes, bis quintum Aequiculus acer, A tribus hunc primum turba Curensis habet.
Et tibi cum proauis, miles Paeligne, Sabinis Conuenit; huic genti quartus utrique deus.
Romulus hos omnes ut uinceret ordine saltem, Sanguinis auctori tempora prima dedit.
Nec totidem ueteres, quot nunc, habuere Kalendas; Ille minor geminis mensibus annus erat.

## ? multa 'multa.'

There is no direct evidence that this word was ever Sabine, see p. 200 sup.
nerio něrīèn- and nerica- 'manliness,' Neria- 'uxor Martis,' neron'manly,' nerioso- 'fortis.'
Gell. 13. 23 comments at length on Nerienem Martis in the Libri Sacerdotum. He states that the quantities are as I have marked, quoting the acc. Neriĕnem from Plaut. Truc. (2. 6. 34) and a voc. sing. (so he definitely implies) Nëriēnes


> Te, Anna, ac Peranna, Panda, te lito, Pales, Nerienes <et> Minerua, Fortuna ac Ceres,
although Ennius ('si, quod minime solet, numerum seruauit'!) and Licinius Imbrex scanned Nēriĕnem: for the inflexion Gellius justly compares Aǔō, Anīēnis, quoting the nom. Nerio from 'libri ueterum.' 'Id autem sive nerio siue nerienes est, Sabinum uerbum est, eoque significatur uirtus et fortitudo. Itaque ex Claudiis, quos a Sabinis oriundos accepimus, quis erat egregia fortitudine Nero appellatus est.' Similarly Suet. Tib. 1, and Lyd. Mens. 4. 42, who gives the goddess as $\mathbb{N} \eta \rho i \nu \eta$, and adds the subst. $\nu \in \rho \iota \kappa \dot{\eta}=\dot{\alpha} \nu \delta \rho \in i a$. Gellius also quotes the nom. Neria (Martis coniux) from Cn. Gellius Ann. 4 in an old invocation. Finally Mai vr. p. 535 a (Löwe Prodrom. p. 349) gives neriosus ' resistens, fortis.'

## nouensiles 'Nouensides.'

Mar. Vict. vi. 26 Keil. Nouensiles siue per $l$ siue per $d$ scribendum. Communionem enim habuit $<l>$ littera <cum $d>$ apud antiquos ut dinguam et linguam et dacrimis et lacrimis et Kapitodium et Kapitolium et sella a sede et olere ab odore; et est communio cum Graecis, nos lacrimae illi סáкpva, olere ò $\delta \omega \delta \dot{e} v a l$, meditari $\mu \in \lambda \epsilon \tau a ̂ \nu$. Novensiles autem, quos Graeci $\sigma v \nu \in ́ v \nu \epsilon a$, post novendii a considendo, id est, eadem sede praediti. [As to the doubtful forms Kapitodium, Gululius, Gudulius, see Postgate, 'Some Latin and Greek Etymologies and the change of $l$ to $d$ in Latin' (reprint from London Phil. Soc. Trans.) Trïbner and Co., 1878.] Arnob. 3. 38. Nouensiles Piso deos esse credit nouem in Sabinis apud Trebiam constitutos (read with Mom. U.D. p. 353 Trebulam). The name occurs also in this form Liv. 8.9.6. Varro L.L. v. 74, (quoted above s.v. Feronia) also calls them Sabine, but gives the name in its pure Latin form nowensides (so C. I. L. $\mathrm{I}^{1} .178$, and in Marsian 261 sup.).

## Romana porta

Fest. 263 M. Porta Romana instituta est a Romulo, infimo clino Victoriae, ...... appellata autem Romana a Sabinis praecipue quod ea proximus aditus Romam : and so Paulus ad loc.

The gloss seems worth quoting as showing, if it may be trusted, that Sabine phrases could make their way even into the vocabulary of Rome itself, for it is hard to see exactly how such a name for a gate in Rome could grow up among Romans themselves.

## Sancus (or -gus) 'deus Sabinus.'

Varro L.L.5.66. Aelius Dium Fidium dicebat Diovis filium ut Graeci $\Delta$ iòs кb́poy Castorem et putabat esse Sancum ab Sabina lingua. Cato ap. Dionys.


 Varro, who l.c. gives diuom $=$ caelum). Liv. 8. 20 gives as dat. Semoni Sango and as gen. Sangus, the latter also in 32.1 , and so Fest. 345 M. (aedi Sancus), followed by Mom. U.D. p. 354 ; the form in inscc. is (dat.) Sanco, e.g. C. I. L. xiv. 2458. With this compare

## Sanqualis porta

'proxima aedi Sancus' Fest. 345 M., and

## Sanqualis auis

Fest. 317 M. Sanqualis auis ap < pellatur......quae in com $>$ mentariis augura<libus...ossifra>ga dicitur quia in <dei Sancus> tatela est. Paul. ad loc. ' ossifraga dicitur.'

SO/ quod ita Sabini, Varro L. L. 5. 68. But see Festus s.v. auso- sup., whose gloss is vexatiously abridged.
strena 'iryieca,' cf. Lat. strena 'a gift on New Year's day boni ominis causa.'
 $\Sigma a \beta i \nu \omega \nu \phi \omega \nu \hat{\eta} \lambda \in \dot{\gamma} \gamma \epsilon \sigma \theta a l \phi \eta \sigma \iota . \quad$ Non. 16 and 33 Merc. connects the Latin word with strenuus, Fest. 313 M. with trinus. Symmach. Epist. x. 35 : Ab exortu paene urbis Martiae strenarum usus adolenit auctoritate Tatii regis, qui uerbenas felicis arboris ex luco $S$ trenuae anni noui auspices primus accepit.

## tebae 'colles.'

Varro R.R. 3. 1. 6. Lingua prisca et in Graecia Boeoti sine adflatu (i.e. aspiration) uocant collis tebas et in Sabinis quo e Graecia uenerunt Pelasgi, etiam nune ita dicunt, cuius uestigium in agro Sabino uia Salaria non longe miliarius cliuos cum appellatur tebae.

I know of no other evidence for this form in Boeotian, as $\Sigma$ common noun, and quite possibly Varro's 'sine adflatu' may be based merely on some archaic writing of $T$ for $\Theta$. G. Meyer in Idg. Forsch. r. p. 324 connects the Sabine word (the Greek 'möglicherweise ') with Carian $\tau \dot{\alpha} \beta \alpha$ ' rock.'

## tesqua 'loca aspera.'

Acron ed. Fabric. ad Hor. Epist. 1. 14. 11. Loca deserta ac difficilia lingua Sabinorum; deserta et repleta sentibus sic nominantur. Porphyr. ad loc. says simply: Loca aspera et siluestria. Mom. (U.D. p. 354) notes that the first is a combination of two scholia; 'sic dicuntur' being added after 'Sabinorum ' in ed. Ascens. 1519.

## $V$ ăcūna 'dea Sabina.'

From C. I. L. Ix. 4636, 4751-2, it appears that Vacuna was worshipped in more than one place in Sabine territory and that vows were paid to her for a safe journey or recovery from sickness, and that she had 5 temple (fanum putre Vacunae Hor. Epist. 1. 10. 49) in the upper Velinus valley above Reate. So the Scholiasts ad Hor. I.c., who quote different identifications of the goddess (with Bellona, Ceres, Diana, Minerva, Venus and Victoria); for the last they cite a passage from Varro 'primo rerum diuinarum' but with variations; Porphyr. ed. Fabric. gives : Varro... Victoriam ait, et ea maxime hi gaudent qui sapientia uincunt. But Schol. Cruq. :...alii Victoriam, deam uacationis, quod faciat uacare a curis. Sed Varro...Mineruam dicit, quod ea maxime hi gaudent qui sapientiae uacant. The first of these two seems incomplete, the second is perhaps not un-Varronian. Ov. Fast. 6. 303 calls her antiqua, but it does not appear whether the custom he mentions (of a feast in front of her altar,) was observed in Rome, though that would seem the simplest meaning of the passage.

## uesperna 'cena.'

See above s.v. cesna.
B. Glosses which are not assigned to the Sabines, but whose form is well attested and appears to show Sabine phonetic characteristics.

## 1. With $\mathrm{f}-=$ pure Latin h -.

a. Words in which $\mathrm{f}-=$ Lat. $\mathrm{h}-=$ proethnic Italic gh ${ }^{\mathbf{1}}$ - as in fedus in A sup. See Brugmann Ürrundr. 1. § 389. p. 292 f. (Eng.) ; Stolz Hist. Lat. Gram. (1894) § 288; on Lat. fu- see Buck Am. Journ. Phil. xi. p. 211.
fariolus 'hariolus'

fordeum 'hordeum' | Ubi antiqui $f$ litteram posuerunt nos h substituimus |
| :--- |
| ut quod illi fordeum dicebant nos hordeum, fa- |
| riolum quem nos hariolum, similiter faedum |
| etc. (v. sup.) Ter. Scaur. vir. 11 Keil. Vel. Longus |
| ib. 81 attributes fasena, fordeum, firci, faedi to |
| the 'antiqui' in a similar passage. |

$\left.\begin{array}{ll}\text { folus } & \text { 'holus' } \\ \text { fostis } & \text { 'hostis' } \\ \text { ? fostia } & \text { 'hostia' }\end{array}\right\} \quad$ v. sup. A s.v. fedo-.

With these must be considered the gloss fuma 'terra' Löwe Prodrom. p. 426, and the Latin doublet filum : hilum (the former being no doubt Sabine) for ghis-lo-, ef. O. H. Germ. keisala 'whip,' Lith. gýsla etc. (Fick, Et. Wtb.', i p. 414); also fel beside Gr. $\chi$ b̀os, fouea beside $\chi \epsilon \epsilon \alpha$.

But Mom. U.D. p. 358 n . is probably right in regarding the words 'trafere' and 'uefere' as mere inventions of the late grammarian Apuleius (De not. Asp. p. 94, Diphthong. 125) who puts them beside fircus etc.
b. Words with $f-=$ Lat $h$-, whose etyma are doubtful.
diuos pater Falacer, flamen Falacer and the Sabine town Falacrinum (310 A inf.), if with Mom. U.D. p. 351 we connect them with Lat. alacer. firco- and fasena (A sup.), are of equally uncertain etymology, but they are expressly assigned to Sabine.
[Note that foleum in C. I. L. x. 1784 is not=oleum v. Mom. ad loc., nor far, farreum (cf. Goth. barizeins) to be compared with hordeum (cf. Germ. gerste) in spite of Paul. ex F. 102 M., a gloss which looks as though it were based on some corruption of a passage in Velius Longus or his authority, v. B 1 a, sup. s. v. fariolus.]

For words with $h$ - $=$ pure Lat. $f$ - v. 349 A Rem. inf.
2. With $1=$ Lat. d .
(See Conway, Idg. Forsch. 2. 157 ff .)
alipes 'adeps,' App. Prob. 199. 2 K.
${ }^{1}$ Pr. Ital. $g h=$ I.-Eu. $g h$ and ' non-labialising' $g h$, but not I.-Eu. 'labialising' $g h$, which became ghu in pr. Italic and $f$ regularly in Latin (e.g. ferus, formus).
casilum antiqui pro casside ponebant, Paul. ex F. 48 M.
impelimenta impedimenta dicebant, id. 108 M .
melica 'gallina Mēdica.'
Varro R.R. 3. 9. 19: ad hanc rem electis maximis gallinis, nec continuo his, quas melicas appellant falso, quod antiqui ut Thetim Thelim ${ }^{1}$ dicebant, sic Medicam Melicam uocabant. Hae primo dicebantur quae ex Medica propter magnitudinem erant adlatae,...postea propter similitudinem amplae omnes. Paul. ex F. 124 M. Melicae gallinae quod in Media id genus auium corporis amplissimi fiat, L litera pro D substituta. The form melica occurs also in Varro R.R. 3. 9. 6, Columella and Pliny.
praesilium 'praesidium.'
Mar. Vict. vi. 9 Keil. Nos nunc et adventum et apud per d potius quam per $r$ scribamus arventum et apur, et linguam per 1 potius quam per $d$, et praesidium per d potius quam perl.
reluuia 'hangnail' (pure Lat. reduuia).
Fest. 270 M . Rediuiam quidam, alii reluuium appellant cum circa unguis cutis se resoluit, quia luere est soluere. Titinius in Setina: Lassitudo conseruum, rediuiae flagri. Et Laeuius (cod. liui): Scabra in legendo reduuiosaque offendens.

Like ex-uviae, the word clearly contains the root of ex-uo, ind-uo.

## Remark. Words used in Latin with $l$ for $d$.

The following Latin words appear to show the change of $d$ to $l$, and I regard as borrowed from Sabine all those whose etymology is clear; the remainder I have marked with a? They are all discussed, and reasons for their having been borrowed are suggested in the article cited above, where one or two other far more doubtful examples are mentioned ${ }^{2}$. Cf. Stolz, Hist. Lat. Gram. (1894) p. 235.
delicatus 'luxui dicatus,' first used of things, ' choice, select.'
Paul. ex F. 70 M . Delicata dicebant dis consecrata quae nunc dedicata. Unde adhuc manet delicatus quasi lusui dicatus. Dedicare antem proprie est dicendo deferre. Id. 73 M ., delicare ponebant pro dedicare. Whether delica 'explana, indica,' quoted by Non. 98 Merc. (whence Plac. 31 Deuerl.) from
${ }^{1}$ This form Varro refers to Ennius in L.L. 7.87, but no satisfactory explanation of it has yet been given. Bergk's (in Philologus 33.155 ) is impossible with our present knowledge of phonetic law. Possibly it was to start with merely a misreading or miswriting of $E^{\prime} t$ on some vase $\dagger$ being taken or put for + , cf. 295 sup.
${ }^{2}$ seliquastra Fest. 340 M . derives from sedeo. Add uligo : udus, lumbricus : Epidaurian $\delta \epsilon \mu \epsilon \lambda \in ́ a s, \delta \epsilon \mu \beta \lambda \epsilon i ̂ s \cdot \beta \delta \epsilon \lambda \lambda a \iota$ Hesych., baliolus: badius, supercilium and calamitas : cado? mālus ( $=$ O.H. G. mast Kluge K. Z. 25.313). But miles if connected with Gr. $\mu$ 淄施, would in Sab. have probably given "misfit-, and ' mulier from $\mu v \zeta^{\prime} \alpha \omega$, the rather moist thing ' is too ridiculous.

Caecilius, Titinius and Plautus (Mil. 3. 2. 31), comes from the same root is doubtful.
lacrima $=0$. Lat. dacrima etc. Paul. ex F. 68 M.
? lapit' 'dolore afficit.' Paul. ex F. 118 M. Non. 23 Merc.
Is it connected with damnum $\delta a \pi \alpha \alpha^{\prime} \eta$ ?
? larix: O. Ir. dair 'quercus' gen. darach; laurus: Welsh derw-en, Stokes Bezz. Beitr..9. 88.
lautia $=0$. Lat. dautia. Paul. ex F. 68 M.
No doubt popularly associated with lautus; possibly derived from duo
'I give' ('dantur legatis hospitii gratia' Paul.).
leuir $=$ Gr. $\delta a \eta j_{\rho}$ i.e. * $\delta a \iota f \eta \rho$, Skt, dēvg-, 'quasi laevus vir' says Non. 557 Merc. and this may have been the popular etymology. Is the $e$ for ae also due to its Sabine origin?
lingua $=$ dingua apud antiquos=Eng. tongue etc. Mar. Victorin. vi. 9 and 26 Keil, v. sup. A, s.v. nowensiles, and B s.v. praesilium. Clearly associated with lingo.
lumpa $=$ Osc. diunpa-. The spelling lympha is due to the (Varronian) derivation from $\nu$ v́ $\mu \phi \eta$ L, L. 7. 87.
? olēre, olfacere, olētum etc. O. Lat. odefacere. Paul. ex Fest. 178-9 M.
The oldest (Plautine) and prevailing use of these words is of bad smells, whereas odor, odoratus etc., are primarily of pleasant ones, see the Lexica. This difference may perhaps justify us in regarding the former group as borrowed from Sabine country folk by the common people.
? prōles if it be connected with Goth. frasts.
Kluge, Kuhn's Z. 25. 313.
? remeligines, if it be connected with meditor, modus etc.
Fest. 277 M. Remeligenes et remorae a morando dictae sunt a Plauto in Casina [4.3.6]: Nam quid illae nunc tam diu intus remorantur remeligines. Ab Afranio in Prodito: Remeligo a Laribus missa sum haec quae cursum cohibeam. Cf. Gloss. Isid. Remilicines remoratrices.
solium and ?? solum, solea, consul, consulo, if they are from the root sed-.
? Clixes='Oঠvareús seems not to belong here.
Kretschmer Kuhn's Z. 29. 430, or Gr. Vaseninschrr. p. 146 ff. quotes the forms 'Oגuteús 'Oגvoreús from 15 genuine Attic vases, beside which the Epic form 'Oסvarধús also occurs. He regards the $\lambda$ as due to an Epirote change, and, noticing that Ithaca was the home of the Odysseus legend, reasonably concludes that the name was first known in Italy from Epirote sources. This confirms Helbig's theory (Hermes XI. p. 257, cf. p. 16 sup.), that the name Graeci, which properly belonged to a tribe round Dodona, came into Italy from the same part of Greece.
D. Glosses whose form is less certain, and which though assigned to Sabine show no specific Sabine characteristics.
ceres 'panis.'
Serv. ad Georg. 1. 7, Sabini Cererem panem appellant, Liberum Lebasium;


This passage is generally taken as giving the Sabine form for Lat. panis, but as it stands it is quite possible to take Panis as the Sabine name for Ceres.
cipro- 'bonus.'
Varro L.L. 5. 159. Vicus Ciprius a Cipro quod ibi Sabini ciues additi consederunt, qui a bono omine id appellarunt; nam ciprum Sabine bonum. Cf. Cupra Maritima inf. 373 A. and Cubrar matrer 354 inf.

## dira 'mala.'

Serv. (Dan.) ad Aen. 2. 235. Sabini et Umbri, quae nos mala, dira appellant.
hirpus 'lupus,' see 186 A sup.
Lebasius 'Liber.'
See s.v. ceres sup., and add Plac. 61 Deuerl. Libassius, 'Liber Pater.' The suffix -asio- occurs in Latin and all the dialects, so that it cannot be regarded in any one word as distinctively Sabine.

## nar 'sulphur.'

Serv. (Dan.) ad Aen. 7. 517. Sabini lingua sua nar dicunt sulfur. Ergo hunc fluuium ideo dicunt esse Nar appellatum quod odore sulfureo nares contingat.

## regia oliua

Pl. H. N. 15. 3. 13. Sergia (oliua) quam Sabini regiam uocant.

## ludi Taurei

Serv. (Dan.) ad Aen. 2. 140. Alii ludos Taureos a Sabinis institutos dicunt.
tereno- 'molle.'
Macrob. 3. 18. 13. Nux Terentina dicitur quae ita mollis est ut uix attrectata frangatur. De qua in libro Fauorini sic reperitur; Item quod quidam Tarentinas oues uel nuces dicunt, quae sunt terentinae a tereno quod est Sabinorum lingua molle; unde Terentios quoque dictos putat Varro Ad Libonem Primo.
? trabea 'regium togae genus.'



 Aen. 7. 612 Quirinali trabea. That worn at Rome by the Salii and Augures was of purple and scarlet (Isid. Orig. 19. 24. 8). Mom. U.D. p. 355, takes $\pi a \tau \rho i \omega s$ to mean $\Sigma a \beta i \nu \eta \gamma \lambda \omega \sigma \sigma \eta$ and traces the note to an extract from Suetonius ap. Chronic. Pas'chal. ad Olymp. xvii. p. 117, edit. Cang.

## ? trimodia 'vasis genus.'

Acron ed. Fabr. ad Hor. Sat. 1. 1. 53. Cumerae dicuntur uasa minora quae capiunt quinque siue sex modios, quae lingua Sabinorum trimodiae dicuntur.

A curious gloss-was cumera originally given as the Sabine word and trimodia the explanation? [In any case, if the word trinodiae is sound, the Sabine modius must have been twice as large as the Roman. J. P. P.] cumera is a rare word (Hor. Ep. 1. 7. 30, Varro L.L. 7. 34, and Paul. ex Fest. 50 and 63 M.).

Note xxxix $\alpha$. Here should be added a remark of Varro L.L. 5. 74. Paulo aliter ab eisdem (Sabinis) dicimus haec ; Palem, Vestam, Salutem, Fortunam, Fortem, Fidem. Et arae Sabinorum linguam olent quae Tati regis uoto sunt Romae dedicatae; nam, ut annales dicunt, uouit Opi, Florae, Vedioui Saturnoque, Soli, Lunae, Volcano et Summano, itemque Larundae, Termino, Quirino, Vortumno, Laribus, Dianae Lucinaeque; equibus nonnulla nomina in utraque lingua habent radices....Potest enim Saturnus hic de alia caussa esse dictus atque in Sabinis, et sic Diana.

及. Ib. §97, the Flor. cod. gives Sauini dicto apruno porco poride porcus, which Spengel corrects to, Sabini dicunt aprinum porcum por; inde porcus. For other, less probable, attempts at restoration, see Spengel ad loc., and Mom. U.D. p. 353 f.
\%. In the liturgy of the Sabines of the Capitol Romanos uernas appellabant, id est, ibidem natos Fest. 372 M., whence Mom., U.D. p. 335, infers that the word is of Sabine origin; if so, the explanation given Verner's Law in Italy, p. 14, may be right, but see Brugmann Grundr. ii. § 66, p. 145 (Eng.).
8. Here perhaps should be quoted ueru Sabellum Verg. Aen. 7. 664, but in Georg. 2. 168 we have Volscosque uerutos; 'Sabellum ' is ambiguous, see below 310 A.

## 310 Place-names ${ }^{1}$ of the Sabini $^{2}$.

## A. Well attested in form, date and locality.

Săbīnī, -nus cl. inscc. (mediaev. and mod. Sabina=the cl. $\dot{\eta}$ इaßiv $)$; the fact that the earliest form was Safin-(v. 169 supra) makes especially remarkable the coincidence with the name of the Sabini in mod. Tal Sabbia just W. of L. Benacus, N. of Brixia, cf. C. I. L. v. 4893.
Săbelli, -llus frequently used = Sabini, -nus, especially in poetry, e.g. Hor. Epist. 1. 16. 49 : but also in cl. prose (e.g. Liv. 8. 1, 10, 19 ; Plin. 3. 12. 107; Strab. 5. p. 250)=Samnites, -ticus. Niebuhr's use of the term $=$ Marsi + Paeligni + Marrucini + Vestini, and Mommsen's (U. D. p. 329) $=$ Marsi + Marrucini + Sabini + Picentes, have no ancient authority.
Aberrigines (-yives), also Abŏrīgĭn- cl. e.g. Dion. Hal. 1. 10, Paul. ex Fest. 19 M., Varro L. L. 5.8 ; referred to Sabine country by Varro ap. Dion. Hal. 1. 14, cf. inf. C. Lycophr. 1253 gives Bopeíyovol.
Via Salaria cl, cf. Varro R. R. 1. 14. 3.
Lŭcrētŭlis mons Hor. Od. 1. 17. 1 al.
Mandēla Hor. Epist. 1. 18. 104 insc.
Varia cl., cf. Dessau C. I. L. xiv. p. 357. Vicováro.
Ustīca 'cubans' Hor. Od. 1. 17. 11 and Schol. ad loc.
Dīgentĭa fl. Hor., but the true Sabine form was probably *Ligentia, Digentia being its name at its confluence with the Anio in Latium, see Conway, Idg. Forsch. II. 162. Licénza f.

Cŭrēs, -ium pl. masc. (Propert. fem.); -ētes, -enses cl. inscc. (?cf. Juno Curītis Schol. Pers. 4. 26, and Propert. 4. 4.9; see 309 A s.v. curis). Corrése (K.).
Trēbŭla Mŭtusca (Mutuesca inscc.), -lani Mutuesci, -cani all cl., of. Umbr. fores Treplanes.
Farfărus fl. cl. Făbăris Verg. Aen. 7. 715 (and following him Sil.); Fabarim quem dicit per Sabinos transit et Farfarus dicitur Serv. ad loc., quoting Plautus and Ovid. These passages are fatal to Keller's view (Lat. Volksetym. p. 13); cf. Conway Idg. Forschungen II. 163 n. 1. Färfa $f$.

[^85]For Amǐternum, -nus, -nīnus, v. 250 A sup.
Septem Aquae Cic. Att. 4. 15. 5 al. Septaq- insce. (? of pure Latin origin).
Caspĕrǐa cl., -eruli Serv. ad Aen. 8. 638.
Interocrium Itinn, oкpéa Stra. 5. 3. 1. Antrodóco.
 tigliáno.
Rĕăte neut., -tini cl. inscc. Riéti.
Văcūnae forum and nemus, -nalis cl. insc., cf. 309 A sup. $B \alpha$ cúgno.
Rōsĕa, -anus cl. (Rōsěa rura Verg. Aen. 7. 712, Rosulanus ager, Serv. ad loc.).
Vělīnus fl. et lac. (also in pl.) cl. insc. Tribus Velina cl. insce. Veliño f.
Ăvens masc. fl. cl.
Falacrinum Suet. Vesp. 2. Itinn., of. Flamen Falacer a diuo patre Falacre, Varro L. L. 5. 84, 7. 45, an otherwise unknown deity whom Mom. U. D. p. 351 refers to the Sabines on the ground of this name, see p. 359 sup. Valle Falacrina.
Tětrĭca, or-cus mons cl.
Nursia, -sinus cl. insc. Nôrcia.
Plin. 3. 12. 107 includes Fidenae, Tibur and Nomentum as Sabine towns, but see under Latini Note xxxvi. A p. 334 f. sup.

## B. Less certain.

Gabii, aqua Gabia (in the Tiber valley) Scholl. Hor. Epist. 1. 11. 7. Gavignáno.
Bandusiae fons Hor. Od. 3. 13, and the Scholiasts ad loc. who identify it with the stream described in Epist. 1. 16. 12, the source of the Digentia. The name must clearly $=\Pi a v \delta o \sigma i a$ (for $b=\pi$ see Note $\mathbf{x x i v}$. sup. p. 227), and this has led some scholars to look for the fountain in Southern Italy (ef. the Bruttian town Pandosia). Hence they have either identified it with, or at least supposed that Horace named it after, a fountain near Venusia (now Sambuco but) called Bandusia in a Bull of Pope Paschalis II., 1103 A.D.

Consuletus riuos C. I. L. rx. 4791.
Tǒlēnus fl., Ov. Fast. 6. 565, Oros. 5. 18 (Tŏlērus Kiep., but this seems to be unsupported). Turcínof. (Kiep.).
Sěvērus M. Verg. Aen. 7. 713, and Serv. ad loc.
[Forum novum Pl. 3. 12. 107 Itinn.]
[Forum Deci Pl. 3. 12. 107 Tab. P.]
Fiscellus mons Varr. R. R. 2. 1.5 and 2. 3. 3; Sil. It. 8. 547.
Vespasiae Suet. Vesp. 1.
Malitiosa silva Liv. 1. $30=\hat{\imath} \lambda \eta$ какô̂pyos Dion. Hal. 3. 33.
Regillum, -llanus el., e.g. Liv. 2. 16, insc., the origin of the gens Claudia; on the probably mistaken form Inregillensis, see Momm. C. I. L. ${ }^{1}$. . p. 444 footnote.

## C. Doubtful.

Tebae cliuos apud Sabinos? v. Sabine Glosses 309 A sup.
Tarinates ? Pl. 3. 12. 108.
Trebulani Suffenates ibid., cf. Tpíßoдa Varro ap. Dion. Hal. 1. 14.
Neminiae ? fons in Reatino Plin. 2. § 230 (called Mé $\boldsymbol{\nu} \tau \boldsymbol{\eta}$ s or Mé $\boldsymbol{\nu} \boldsymbol{\tau} \boldsymbol{\eta}$ by Isigonus Nicaensis, Miill. Fragm. Hist. Gr. iv. p. 427).
Mutela mons Frontin. Controv. p. 21 Lachm.
Lymphae Commotiae ad lacum Cutilianum Varr. L. L. 5. 71.
Pitinum Tab. P.
Canterius mons Varr. R. R. 2. 1. 8.
The following (besides Tpíißoдa) are the communities which Varro (ap. Dion. Hal. 1. 14) attributes to the 'Aberrigines' in Sabine territory (cf.
 M Mфída, 'Opovivoov, Kopoovia, "I $\sigma \sigma a$ (an island in a lake), Batia. To these he adds Tเம́pa Mariŋivp and sióva in Aequian country.
D. Further modern names.

Nerola, Fâra, Archi, Frásso Sabíno, Toffia, Petescia, Póggio Moüino, Mompeo, Bocchignáno, Stimiglano, Cantalupo, Selci, Magliano, Aspra, Vacone, Poggio Fidoni, Stroncone, Moggio, Collescipoli, Cönca, Cascia, Savelli, Valcaldara, Frascaro, Cornia F., Triponzo, Visso.

311 Personal Names ${ }^{1}$ of the Sabines ${ }^{2}$.
A. Frequent.

1. Nomina.

| Abelasia | Flauia | Petronia cf. inf. |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Abidia | Inlia | Pituania |
| Albia | Licinia | Septimia |
| Aurelia | Marcia | Titia |
| Claudia | Memmia | Valeria |
| Cornelia | Octauia cf. inf. | Vibia inf. |

2. Among the Cognomina may be mentioned.

Rufus Saluius praen. et cogn.

## B. Less frequent.

1. Nomina.

| Abiena (one insc.) | Aurea | Coelia |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Aburtennia | Aueia | Cominia |
| Accia | Aufidia | Corfidia |
| Aelia | Auidia | Cosia |
| Aerusia (one insc.) | Baia |  |
| Allia | Bruttia | Domitia |
| Ancharena | Caecilia | Egnatiena (one insc.) |
| Ancharia | Caesia | Entedia? (one insc.) |
| Andiuia (one insc.) | Caesiena | Fabricia |
| Annaea | Caiedia | Faiania (one insc.) |
| Annia | Calpurnia | Fufia |
| Anniena (once Ani-) | Carantia (one insc.) | Fuluia |
| Antistia | Catia | Fundilia |
| Appaea | Catunia (one insc.) | Gauiena (one insc.) |
| Arria | Clodia | Greia |
| Atria | Cluuia (once Cluia) | Heluidia |
| Attiena | Cocceia | Herennia |

${ }^{1}$ For the arrangement and notation see the List of Signs and Abbreviations.
${ }^{2}$ From C. I. L. Ix. 4534-5012, 6352-6364 etc. The names from places in the upper Aternus valley round Amiternum (cf. p. 258) are not here included, as they have been counted with those of the Vestini 301 sup.

| Iuentia (one insc.) | Nonia cf. inf. | Senenia (one insc.) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Iunia | Opidiena | Sentia |
| Laelia | Oppia | Sergia |
| Larcia (one insc.) | Papiria | Sextia |
| Liuia | Peducaia | Suetonia |
| Lucretia | Pescennia | Sulpicia |
| Ludia | Petillia (once -ilia) | Titlenia (one insc.) |
| Luuiana l. (one insc.) | Plutia l. (one insc.) | Tullia |
| Maelia (one insc.) | Pompeia | Turpilia |
| Maltinia | Pomponia | Turrania (one insc.) |
| Manlia | Pontia | Varia |
| Maria | Publilia | Vassia |
| Maridia l. (one insc.) | Pupia (once Puppia) | Verania |
| Messia (one insc.) | Racilia | Veserena (one insc.) |
| Minatia | Reatina | Vettia |
| Mucia | Rubria | Vettesia (one insc.) |
| Mumia (as often | Rufria | Vettlaea (one insc.) |
| -mm-) | Rustia | Vettulena |
| Munia | Satridia | Vlpia |
| Musurria | Satronia (one insc.) | Vollia |
| Muttina (one insc.) | Saturia (one insc.) | Vruina |
| Nigidia (one insc.) |  |  |
|  |  |  |

2. Among the Cognomina.

Aeschinus 7.
Apronianus
Aulina
Brocchus
Cerialis

Corenthus
Damal.
Daphne (twice, once -ene, once -ine)

Senenia (one inse.)
Sentia
Sergia
Sextia
Suetonia
Sulpicia
Titlenia (one insc.)
Tullia
Turpilia
Turrania (one insc.)
Varia
Velenia
Verania
Veserena (one insc.)
Vettia
Vettesia (one insc.)
Vettlaea (one insc.)
Vettulena
Vlpia
Vollia
Vruina
C. Once only.

1. Nomina.

| Acestia | Babria | Cossutia |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Aedia | Baburia | [C]uspia <br> Aemilia |
| Baebia | Didia |  |
| Alfena | Betuina | Etr[ilia] |
| Alliedia | Brittia | Fabia |
| Amarfia | Caedia | Falcidia |
| Ampia | Caesellina | Faltonia |
| Anicia | $\underline{\text { Caesidia }}$ | Feronia |
| Aponia | Caluia cf. inf. | Fretria |
| Atia | Camuria | Frigidia |
| Audiena $l$. | Capria | Gallia $l$. |
| Auia | Casidaria | Gergenia |
| Auillia | Corania | Halicia |

Herennuleia
Hostilia
Iepriena
Lollia
Lucceia
Maclonia $l$.
Mesena
Metidiena
Modieia
Muluia
Murrenia
Nerusia
Numisia cf. inf.
Orania
Oscial.
Passidiena $l$.
Petidia
Petisia
Pisentia
Pompullia
Popillia

Postumia
Prastina (nom.masc.)
Prifernia
Rosiceial.
Sabidia $c f$. $i n f$. Salfeia
Sarrena
Satrena
Scaptinal.
Segulia
Seria
Seruia
Sosia
Staatia inf.
Surredia $l$.
Taminia
Thebania
Tidena
Titilenia $l$.
Titinia

Titulena
Tonnia
Torenas
Tuecia
Varena
Vargu[nteia]
Variena
Varin...
Varina
Vedia
Veiena

- Venedial.

Verana
Veria
Vesena
Veturia
Vigillia
Vipstana
Vitudia
Volumnia

1 a. To these may be added the following names of mythical or historical persons: Attus Clausus Liv. 1. 36 al., "Avт $\rho \omega \nu \mathrm{Kopá} \mathrm{\tau}$ ©os Juba ap. Plut. Qu. Rom. 4, Mettus Curtius cl., Modius Fabidius Varro ap. Dion. Hal. 2. 48, Fircellius Pauo Varro R. R.3.2.2, Appius Herdonius cl., Hersilia Macr. Sat. 1. 6, Gell. 13. 21, Numa Pompilius cl., Terentii p. 362 sup., Vitellii Suet. Vit. 1. [Almost wholly from Mom. U. D. p. 355 ff.]

## 2. Among the Cognomina.

Aprilis
Burrus
Cessinus
December $l$.
Faentina (i.e. Fau-)
Fudidianus

Himer
Marulla
Nonnus
Posilla
Rufinus

Rumnus
Stanno
Statius praen.
Teria
Vettulla

## 2 a. Praenomina.

To those included in $1 a$ above the following may be added as belonging to mythical Sabines: Calpus (Paul. ex F. 47 M. al.), Mamercus (Plut. Num. 8), Sabus (Cato ap. Dion. Hal. 2. 49, Sil. 8. 421), Talus (Fest. 359 M. al.), Titius (Paul. ex F. 366 M.), Volesus, -usus (Fest. 198 M. s.v. optima lex, Ov. Pont. 3. 2. 105 al.). Mommsen further accepts (U. D. p. 355-8) from the Auct. de Nom. Albus, Ancus and Pompus.

## F. Falisci.

In the early history of this tribe among conflicting myths ${ }^{1}$ two points are fairly certain, that they were akin to the Sabines across the Tiber, and that their city was subdued and governed by the Etruscans. The first is clear from their language, their worship of the Sabine deities Juno Quiritis (e.g. Ov. Fast. 6. 49, C.I. L. XI. 3125) and Feronia (e.g. Liv. 26.11), and from the cult of Dis Soranus by the Hirpi or fire-leaping priests on Mt Soracte (cf. 351 A inf.). The second is obvious in the whole history of the town from the fifth century b.c. In all the wars between Rome and Etruscan towns (Livy, Books 4, 5, 7 and 10) they supported the latter, and more than once took a leading part (id. 4. 23, 5. 17 and 7.17). None of their numerous quarrels with Rome from 437 (?) b.c. onwards (Liv. 4. 17) led to any decisive result until their rebellion in the year 241 b.c., when the city, despite its strong position on a hill with steep sides, was taken (e.g. Polyb. 1. 65) and mulcted of half its territory. Soon after ('v' $v \tau \epsilon \rho o \nu$, , Zonaras 8.18 ) the inhabitants were compelled to depart from the old city, which was razed, and to build for themselves in the plain five miles or so to the west a town which was first known as municipium Faliscum, but which probably from the time of Octavian, certainly in inscc. of the 3rd century A.D., is called colonia Faliscorum ; to this Lib. Colon. p. 217 Lachm. adds the epithet Junonia, stating that it was a colony of the IIIvirs (cf. also Pliny 3. § 51 'colonia Falisca Argis orta quae cognominatur Etruscorum'). In the middle ages the new site was in its turn deserted for the old, on which the small town of Cività Castellana now stands, the

[^86]memory of the colony being preserved only by the name of a church still on the site, S. Maria di Falleri. From this latter come most, possibly all, the Latin inscc., and about a third of the Faliscan (312-320 with Note xl.). Besides 335, whose Latin has suffered very little from its Faliscan authors and which dates from Gracchan times, and 336 which may be somewhat later, there is a Latin insc. of clearly republican date, C. I. L. xi. $3073^{1}$. While therefore we have no direct evidence that pure Faliscan died out before say 150 B.C., on general grounds it may well have lasted till 200 ; indeed the $a \beta$ of 321 (which in any case must be later than 241 b.c.), where $l$ has nearly a right angle and $e$ is rectangular, suggests a date well within the second century.

The inscc. which follow are written from r. to 1 . in the following, i.e. the Faliscan, $a \beta$, except as noted in each case.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Я } a, \supset c, \bigcirc d, \lambda e, \notin z, \uparrow f, \forall h, \mid i, \sqrt{ } l, W m, \bigvee n, \bigcirc 0 \text {, } \\
& \urcorner p, ภ r, \downharpoonleft s, \curlyvee t, \vee u, \times x \text {. }
\end{aligned}
$$

The interpunct is regularly double.

For further details of the history of the Faliscans see Deecke, Die Falisker, passim, and C. I. L. xI. p. 465 f. The graves opened in the last few years have been rich in archaeological material, now collected in the Museo della Villa Giulia at Rome and reported at length in Notizie degli Scavi; but apart from their evidence of the wealth of the town their only importance for us is to prove, if proof be needed, that its civilisation was essentially Etruscan. Hence, while including inscc. which show both Etruscan and Italic characteristics, I have felt no hesitation in excluding several whose forms have no Italic marks whatever (see the Appendix). Those which are too fragmentary to be called either Faliscan, Etruscan or Falisco-Etruscan, I have separated in Notes xl. and xli.

[^87]312-320 with Note xl. Inscriptions of the older Falerii (Civitd̀ Castellana).

312 On two paterae found in 1886-7 in a tomb in the 'necropoli della Penna' near Civ. Castellana and first published by Lignana, Mittheil. Rom. ii. 196, then in Not. Scav. 1887 p. 273 ; now in the Museo d. Villa Giulia at Rome where I copied them in April, 1894. Their genuineness is beyond all question as the letters were painted before the paterae were glazed.

> a. foied uino pafo cra car[ef $] 0$
> b. foied uino pipafo cra carefo

Fal. a $\beta$ (but with $\mathrm{N} \alpha,>c, \exists e, \mathcal{A}_{r}$, and single interp.) in black, on a red ground filling part of the margin (the rest being occupied by stencilling of the ordinary 'Greek pattern'), round an erotic scene ${ }^{1}$, the picture being identical in the two paterae. The last word of ( $\alpha$ ) appears to have been complete when Lignana sketched it. Pauli noticed the insc. in Berlin. Phil. Woch. 1888 p. 515. Deecke 34.

313 Painted on a tile found in a tomb in the same necropolis: published by Pasqui in Not. Scav. 1889 p. 154, who states that 'the tomb contained CampanoEtrusean vases commonly found in Etruscan graves at the end of the IV century b.c.'

## caui .latrio

The first letter of the second word has lost its top, and may be $\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{f}$ or $\mathbf{p}$. Etr. $\alpha \beta$ ( $A_{a}, \dagger t$ ).

314 Painted on plaster above a niche in a large grave near the Ponte Terrano; from Zvet. It. Med. viur. 7, who like Deecke 7 and Fabr. 2411 bis $e$ depends on Garrucci Dissertaz. tav. iii. 6, Syll. insce. Lat. 796.

## ...rco pleina marcio man. mo cauiacue | . eculia uoltilia uentarc... he cupa]nt

$t$ is $T$. Deecke would restore in 1.2 uentarcoi he cupant from 325, 335 , etc. In the same grave and the same $\alpha \beta$ was a fragmentary insc. ending -ata Oannia, which I count Etruscan (see the Appendix).

[^88]315 Painted on plaster over tiles, in a grave with pillars two miles from Civ. Cast. on the road to Falleri; found by 'un tal Mariani' and first published from a sketch by him in Garr. Diss. tav. iv. 2, whence Zvet. It. Med. viir. 9, Deecke 9, Fabr. 2441 bis $g$.
$s$ is reversed $(S)$.

## cmecio a | cesilia

316-320 Painted on plaster over tiles which closed in different niches (there were 19 in all) in a large Faliscan grave discovered in 1881 in the vineyard of Sign. Lucidi to the east of Civ. Cast., and first published by Gamurrini in Not. Scav. 1883 p. 165 ff ., who states that the type of the tomb is peculiarly Faliscan and can be safely assigned to the 3 rd or 4th century b.c. The niches had been long since broken into, so that the tiles were left only in fragments, but these have now been taken to the Museo Falisco. They were read by Dr W. Deecke (junior) in 1887 and his text (which differs but little from Gam.'s which I have followed save where the opposite is stated) is given in his father's Falisker pp. 142 ff.; six of them are quoted from Not. Scav. by Bormann C. I. L. xI. 3162 note $c$.

316 iuna ce | arutil.. (possibly tilio)

## 317 seiclio | icasilio

These two, which Deecke separates, Gam. thought formed the beginning and end of one insc. with two tiles lost between.
$318(a)$...ilio cesi f | ...i cauia
e is here II, 3 the normal $Я$; the interp. is single, and wanting after $\dot{i}$ in both lines; some letters are lost at the beginning of each line.
(b) On a preceding tile were the fragments
...elio | ...rpi..a (or ...rzi..a)

319 (a) ...elio ceilio | ...om...rex..iai
The first and third $\mathbf{e}$ are 3 , the second $I$; the signs for $\mathbf{r}$ and a are identical.
(b) On a layer of plaster put over that on which the preceding insc. was painted, the following fragments appeared (single interp.) ;
...eico uoc... | ...uatu..eco... | ...u exi.... | ...pal.... imr (or ima)

## 320 <br> celio

Only seen by Dr W. Deecke. e is $\exists$.

Note xl. The following fragments must be counted doubtful in point of either (a) dialect (i.e. they may be pure Etruscan) or ( $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ ) authenticity in whole or part. 1-13 (painted) were found with $316-320$ sup., $1-10$ were seen by both Gamurrini (Not. Scav. 1883 p. 165 ff.) and the younger Deecke, 11-14 by the latter alone (Fal. 15-24 and 26-28). 14 (Fal.6) which is cut in stone was seen by Zvetaieff (It. Med. 50) in the same group of tombs as 314 sup. 15-18 are said by Garrucci (Dissert. tav. iii., reproduced by Zvet. It. Med. viri. 1.2.5.6) to be cut in stone and to come from the same place, but they depend on his authority only. 19-23 are painted in 5 tomb at la Penna (where 312-313 were found), and were seen both by Gamurrini (Not. Scav. 1887 p. 263 ff .) and the younger Deecke, but the latter doubted their genuineness; 24-26 are reported from the same place by Gam., but were not even seen by Deecke. I have given what, so far as I can judge, is the most likely reading in each, but for further details the reader must be referred to the authorities mentioned, save that variations from the normal Fal. $\alpha \beta$ are mentioned below; the interpunct is: unless otherwise described.

## a. Well attested but of doubtful dialect.

1. celioi $\mid$ utpos ( $e$ is II)
2. ...reio... | ...rxoi...
3. $\ldots u p a \ldots$ ( $a$ is $\wedge$ and so in $4,6,7,9,10,13$ )
4. ...pan... | ...cail...
5. nutr... or nuta...
6. ...iena u... | ...ono ux...
7.     - tanacu... | anelia...
8. re... | mi... | cu... | ma...
9. ...ila... | ...ic...
10. Ir $i e \mid c a i . .$.
11. ...cisi... | ...ipo... (s is reversed)
12. ...cfi $\mid \ldots a f c$ ( $a$ is $\mathbb{\wedge}$ )
13. ...at... | ...iac... | ...cal...
14. ...uoll...

及. Of doubtful authenticity.
( $15-18=$ Fabr. 2441 bis. )
15. leiueliopertis | uolti......... ( $r$ is h, $s$ is reversed)
16. wel uisni olna (s is reversed; single interp.)
17. caui t.....cela ( $a$ is $A$, as in $18,23,26$ )
18. t.pi uez $\theta i$ cela
19. iuna oufilio poplia ( $a$ is $\wedge$, as in $20, n N$, no interp.)
20. cauio. au filio ganacuil (no interp.)
21. caui. caucilio poplia (single interp.)
22. kai...i...ilio
23. puponio fia...mio (or plio; single interp.)
24. ... wollia... (the second $l$ is ل $ل$ )
25. ...uelzu | ...eo fe ( $z$ is $t$ as in 26)
26. calin | rezo

321-336 Inscriptions of the younger Falerii (S. Maria di Falleri).

321 ronze tablet, $20 \frac{3}{4}$ in. long by $6 \frac{3}{4} \mathrm{in}$. high ( $\cdot 52$ by $\cdot 17 \mathrm{~m}$.), in two halves of which the first was found in S. M. di Falleri in 1860 in front of the 'Porta Cimina,' the second in 1870, and both presented by Garrucci to the Museo Kircheriano where I saw them in April, 1894; first published by G. in Ann. Ins. Arch. Rom. 1860 p. 266 tav. F, and in Archaeologia, London, xLiti. (1871) p. 43; a good facsim. Zvet. It. Med. vir. 4.
menerua sacru.| Ia cotena la f pretod de | zenatuo sententiad uootum | dedet, cuando datu rected| cuncaptum

Very clearly cut from r. to 1 . in normal Faliscan $a \beta$ (see above, $p .371$ ), with the cross-bars of $e$ horizontal, of $t$ and $z$ sloping; $s$ is reversed both in 11.1 and $3(S)$. Interp. single. In 1.2 only the oblique bar of the first 1 is left on the edge, and of $\underline{\underline{r}}$ three bits on the two edges of the break across the middle, but these are enough for certainty.

All four corners have lost a piece of bronze, which shows that the whole was a label, affixed to some votive object, possibly an altar. For the meaning of the last clause I would compare C. I. L. III. 1933 quoted in Note xxviii. p. 261 sup. and take cuncaptum to mean 'measured,' cf. Front. Aquaed. 67, 73, or 'orientated,' cf. p. 184 f. sup.

We hear of Minerva as worshipped at Falerii in the legend given by Ovid Fast. 3. 84.3-4, where he asks whether Minerva capta on the Caelian was so called

An quia perdomitis ad nos captiua Faliscis
Venit? Et hoc signo littera prisca docet.
On this Prof. Postgate suggests to me that the littera prisca may really mean an insc. in Faliscan character; Deecke takes it to mean simply an archaic Latin insc.

Mommsen Jahresb. K. Preuss. Akad. Wiss. Berlin, 1860 p. 452 , whom Büch. follows in Lex. Italicum s.v. quando. Bréal gives a fantastic interpretation in Mém. Soc. Ling. Paris, IV. p. 400, which Deecke seems to accept (Fal. no. 36, Rh. Mus. XLI. 202). Zvet. It. Med. 68, Fabr. Suppl. I. p. 113, C. I. L. XI. 3081.
322. Fragment of bronze found at S. M. d. Falleri, once in possession of Garrucei, from whose Sylloge (810) are taken Zvet. It. Med. 69 and the text; Fal. as.
...ilio c...

323 'Painted over a mosaic floor in the entrance of an aedicula.' So Garrucci, on whom alone ohe insc. depends, as it is not now in existence; published by him in his tract on the Canoni Epigrafici di Federico Ritschl, Rome 1870 tav. 6 p. 33, whence Zvet. It. Med. vir. 3.

## .hirmio m ce tertineo c f pret

Fal. aß but with $T$ and $T$. This may be only due to G.'s copy, but the discrepancy suggests that the first ' $t$ ' may have been $z$ with its lower bar lost. Of $t$ in pret only the tip of the bar is left.

Deecke 38, Zvet. It. Med. 67.

324-333 Painted on tiles with a coating of stucco; discovered in two (out of a group of five) graves near S. M. d. Fulleri in 1851 by Guidi, and published from his sketches in Bull. Ins. Arch. Rom. $1854^{1}$ p. xxii, more accurately by Garr. in Ann. Ins. Arch. Rom. 1860 p. 272 ff., whence Fabretti 24422452 ; Zvetaieff saw all of them that were in existence in 1880, i.e. all except 324 and parts of 325,332 and 333 , and gives his sketches $I t$. Med. vIII-x., which, though the inscc. were slightly more decayed, agree very well with G.'s, so that there is no serious doubt as to the text. Deecke gives them Fal. nos. 39-46 and 60-61, Zvet. It. Med. 56-65. 325-333 came from a single grave, but date from more than one period; see below.

324 uipia zertenea loferta | marci acarcelini | mate he cupa
$325(a)$ and $(b)$. The first and oldest of these is painted directly on the tiles; the second on the coating of stucco which was laid on when the niche which they closed in was used a second time; in (a) the sign for e is the regular $\exists$, in (b) it is II, in both the interp. is double. In (b) Garr. gives ad fin.

[^89]hiu cupat, but his $\mathbf{u}$, which is split by the division of two tiles, is probably only the second stroke of II followed by an interp.

## a. caui[a] uecinea votili[a | maci acacelini uxo

b. marcio acarcelinio | cauia uecinea he cupat

326 . This again consists of two inscc. on the same tiles, but both in the same vertical plane, $(a)$ in the line above (b) ; in ( $a$ ) we have $\mathcal{F}, \boldsymbol{U}, r$; in (b) we have II, $N$ and $\dagger$, and $\Gamma$ twice beside 7 once. In a third line, at the beginning, are three doubtful signs, much smaller than those of ( $a$ ) or (b), variously read ecu and he]c cu[pa.
a. tito acarcelinio..
b. ma fi pop petrunes ce $f$ conia
$328(a)$ and $(b)$ are related in point of position just as ( $a$ ) and ( $b$ ) of 325 , and as in those, the earlier has $\exists$, the later $I$; in (b) the third $\mathbf{c}$ is reversed, C. Interp. single.
a. ca uecineo uolti | he cupat meania

Deecke reads hei, but the stroke after e looks doubtful and may be an accidental fleck.

> b. ca uecineo | ca mania
e is $I I, \mathrm{c}$ is reversed; only the hasta of $\underline{\underline{1}}$ remains.

330 p and s are reversed; 1 is the cursive $\lambda$.
pola marcia sus

331 I is $\lambda$ as in 330 ; interp. single.

## 1 clipiai

332 (a) and (b) as in 325, save that the insce. seem to have been identical. In both we have Lat. $a \beta$ 1. to $r$. with $\lambda$, II.
a. ...... | harisp am.... | sor....censo

The second line ended with very doubtful signs, amco written from r. to 1. so that the is next to the preceding am.
b. m clipeario $\mathrm{m} \mid$..... | ....or

333 In Lat. $\alpha \beta(\llcorner\Gamma)$ on three tiles, generally read as one insc., but as the size of the writing varies between the parts on the several tiles in each of the first two supposed long lines, especially between (b) and (c), I doubt if they belong together. The interp. is single in all three and e is E , but that value is generally given also to the concluding \| of 1.3 in (a). Only the first tile was seen by Zvetaieff (It. Med. x. 3).
(a)
c clipear
m f harac..
sorex q CVII
(a) 2 Garr. read haracna, the a lying on the edge of (a).

Handsomely painted on a large tile from the neighbourhood of Falleri, which I saw in the Museo d. Villa Giulia in April 1894, but which I have not yet seen published.

## cauiai leueli | filea

Fal. a $\beta$ with $\AA$ for $a$, but $s$ in cauiai wants its cross stroke $(\wedge)$.

335 =C. I. L. xı. 3078, Zvet. It. Med. 70 from Garrucci, who possessed it and first published (a) in Archaeologia, London, xLII. (1871) p. 259, and both (a) and (b) in the reverse order, in Sylloge Inscc. Lat. 557-8. To whom it passed on his death I do not know.
(a) iouei iunonei mineruai | falesce quei in sardinia sunt | donum dederunt. magistreis | l latrius $k$ f, c salu[e]na uoltai f | coiraueront.
(b) gonlegium quod est aciptum aetatei aged[ae opiparum ad ueitam quolundam festosque dies, quei soueis a..utieis opidque uolgani gondecorant sai..sume comuiuia loidosque,
5 ququei huc dederun[t i]nperatoribus summeis, utei sesed lubent..[be]ne iouent optantis.
' On two sides of a bronze tablet $\cdot 28 \mathrm{~m}$. long, $\cdot 09 \mathrm{~m}$. high ' Garr. Lat. $a \beta$ professing to be of 200 b.c. ( $\vee, Q)$, but, as the variations in the use of double letters (aciptum, summeis), of $u$ and $\mathbf{o}$ (coiraueront beside latrius and dederunt), of $\mathbf{c}$ and g (uolgani etc.) appear to me to show, written considerably later, probably in Gracchan times, with an attempt at archaism. Interp. single, omitted, as usual, after the preposition in (a) 2, and wrongly inserted between i]nperato and ribus (b) 5. The punctuation is obvious. (a) 4 so Bormann C.I. L. l.c., others saluiena. (b) 3 argutieis or astutieis. 4 probably saipisume. 6 no doubt lubentes.

Büch. ap. Zvet. l.c. first pointed out that ququei = coqui, comparing Volcano studes, said of a cook in Plaut. Aul. 3559. For imperatores of deities cf. Liv, 6. 29 (Jupiter imperator), and Cic. Verr. Iv. 57. 128-9. On the rough Saturnian metre of (b) see Lindsay Am. J. Phil. xiv. p. 139 and 305 ff.

Deecke 62, C. I. L. and Zvet. It. Med. ll.cc.
$336=$ C. I. L. xiv. $3160, \mathrm{r}^{1} .1313$. Cut in huge letters ( $5 \mathrm{in} ., 013 \mathrm{~m}$. high) on a rock forming the back wall of the pronaos of a large tomb on the road between Civ. Cast. and S. M. di Falleri ; it is now removed to the Museo d. Villa Giulia in Rome, where I saw it in April 1894. It was first published by Dennis, Bull. Ins. Arch. Rom. 1844 p. 162, and then in his Cities and Cemeteries of Etruria $\mathbf{I}^{1}$. p. 132 ( $=\mathrm{r}^{2}$ p. 99).

## 1 uecilio uof e..... | polae abelese.... | lectu I datus; $\mid$ 4,5,6 . uecilio 1 f et plenese | lectu I; amplius nihil | inuiteis 1 c leuieis $1 \mathrm{f} \mid$ et quei eos parentaret, | ne anteponat.

Deeply cut in Lat. $a \beta$ (AEFLMFSTV) of Sullan or Ciceronian period, with finials and single triangular interp. The tufa is so rough that it is difficult to judge from the appearance of the rock whether any letters have disappeared in the blank spaces at the end of $11.1-3$, and Bormann is probably right in calling the insc. 'integra,' certainly in point of 1.3 , which begins and ends some way within the margin. The letters marked as injured are hard to read, and flaws in the tufa have produced several more interpuncts than are wanted, but there is no doubt as to the text as it stands.
anteponere denotes the use of the same bier or niche for a second interment, and this encroachment on the rights of the dead, which was not uncommon in Falerii (cf. 325, 332 sup.), is here forbidden save with the sanction of the two Livii (possibly connexions by marriage, in any case the owners of the grave) and of the kinsman to whom fell the duty of parentatio (Mom. C. I. L. I I. l.c.).

Deecke (Fal. no. 81) is no doubt right in regarding parentaret as a variant for -tarit; it is simplest, and most probable from the usual syntax of dependent clauses in legal or quasilegal documents, to regard -et as parallel to that of ded-et (321 sup.), i.e. equivalent to the Lat. - $\mathfrak{i t}$ of the fut. perf. ind.

Deecke l.c., C. I. L. l.c.

[^90]endings seem definitely Etruscan, the suffix -ikno- appears in the Gallic insc. of Tuder (see the Appendix), though it is also common in Etruscan (Deecke p. 198).

The insc. is cut along two sides of $\begin{gathered}\text { E triangular bronze plate, from l. to r. in }\end{gathered}$ Faliscan or Latin $a \beta$ ( $\mathcal{A} \uparrow$ ) with double interpunct.
caui tertinei posticnu
Zvet. It. Med. 66, tab. vii. 2 from Garrucci (Syll. no. 809) who possessed it.
( $\beta$ ) I can make nothing of some broken tiles with letters given by Gamurrini Not. Scav. 1891 p. 49.

## 337-344 Inscriptions of Carbognano.

These eight inscc. were all found at Carbognano, to the N.W. of Falleri, in a single grave, in June 1881 and published by Dressel in Bull. Ins. Arch. Rom. 1881 p. 151 , with a facsimile, whence the text. They are all in Faliscan $\alpha \beta$, with certain variations: in 337 S is $\mathcal{E}, \boldsymbol{z}$ is $У$; in 338 and 340 e is 11 , in 3381 is $Y$; in 342 there are several doubtful half-cursive signs ; v. inf.

$$
\underline{0 \underline{1}} \text { is } \backsim \text {. }
$$

338
uoltio | folcozeo | zextoi | fi

339 (greatly damaged)
caio folcuz. 0 | ..io | poplia..c | .....f
cepio folcu.o
cu. is $N$

## 345 Inscription of Corchiano.

On a tile found in one of a set of Faliscan graves in Corchiano to the N. of Falleri in 1886, and published by Deecke (Fal. no. 56) from his son's sketch, whence the text, and by Lignana in Mittheil. Rom. II. p. 199.

## popia calitenes | aronto ceisies | lartio uxor

In regular Fal. $a \beta$ except $A$ and $T$ (in 11. 2 and 3 , but $\gamma$ in 1. 1 ; $s$ is rather square $(Z)$.

With it were two others with pure Etr. inscc. containing the sign $\boldsymbol{\lambda}=\boldsymbol{e}$, which is perhaps to be recognised in some of the Carbognano group.

## 346-8 Capena.

Of the insec. scratched on vases found on the site of this town (the surrounding territory received the Roman citizenship in 389 b.c. and was included in the tribus Stellatina in 387, Liv. 6. 4-5) only the following present features which vary from urban Latin, without being (so far as I can judge) pure Etruscan (Deecke, Fal. 64, 65, 67). They were published by Henzen Bull. Ins. Arch. Rom. 1864, p. 147.

Deecke p. 204 and Zvet. It. Med. p. 66 add OIXOTヨ 3 and $\uparrow \mid X$ on Garrucci's authority (Sylloge n. 817 and 824) and one or two other fragments.

## 349 Faliscan Glosses.

## A. Well attested.

cenaculum v. 306 A sup.

Decimatrus 'dies festus post x diem Iduum,' v. sup. ibid., s.v. Septimatrus, ad fin.
haba 'faba.'
Ter. Scaurus p. 2252 Putsch: quam Falisci habam, nos fabam appellamus. The form is assigned to the 'antiqui' by Vel. Long. p. 2238 Putsch, quoted s.v. fedo- 309 A sup., cf. the Remark below.

Struppearia 'dies festus apud Faliscos ubi coronati ambulabant,' v. sup. 306 A s.v. struppus.

Hălaesus (less frequently -ēsus) 'a quo se dictam terra Falisca putat,' Ov. Fasti 4. 73.

Similarly Serv. ad A. 7. 695, 8. 285. Cf. Ov. Amor. 3. 13. 31, Verg. A. 7. 723, 10. 417. Should we compare the river and town Halaesus, Halaesa on the N. coast of Sicily, or, with Sil. It. 8. 474, the Etruscan town Alsium? Deecke discusses the form at length (Fal. p. 22 ff) and prefers the spelling Halēs- on somewhat doubtful phonetic grounds.

For the temple of Feronia on Mt Soracte see below 351 A.

Remark. Beside the words in which the pure Latin form has $h$ - ( $=$ pr. Ital. $g h$ ) as contrasted with Sabine $f$ - ( 309 B 1), there would seem to be other examples
of the variation between $f$ - and $h$-, in which the forms with $h$ - ( $=d h$ - or bh-) must be as certainly non-Latin in origin as they are in use. The dialect to which they belong cannot at once be determined ${ }^{1}$. I doubt if it is Sabine, since the people who labialised even the guttural aspirates represented in Latin by $h$-, would hardly, perhaps, have broken down into $h$ - the original labial or dental aspirates ( $b h$ - and $d h-=$ Lat. $f$-). But the Faliscan words quoted above (haba, Halaesus) afford fair prima facie evidence for assigning the change to Faliscan, since haba, faba must be compared (Fick Et. Wtb. ${ }^{4}$ p. 488) with O. C. Sl. boturu, O. Pruss. babo 'bean,' and Halaesus seems to contain a form of the groundstem of the name of his people Falis-ci, Faler-ii, Fales-ia; Deecke (Fal. p. 258) quotes also hirmio ( 323 sup.) as $=$ Lat. Firmius ${ }^{2}$. But, on the other hand, what of the Faliscan forms filio, Folcozeo (338), Fertrio (348), Feronia (351 A), Fescennia (ibid.), Fourios, Flauius ( 350 B and A), and before all the name Falisci, Falerii itself, which was certainly the form in use in the two towns? Some at least of these, like Sab. fedo- and Fal. foied, may contain a guttural aspirate, but on the other hand Deecke (l.c.) attributes them all to the Latin or Etruscan element in the population, and in particular it must be remembered that the town itself was in the harids of Etruscans till 343 b.c., and in close contact with Latinspeaking settlers from 389 в.c. onwards v. p. 383 sup.

The forms with $h$ - are
hanula 'parva delubra, quasi fanula' Paul. ex F. 103 M., generally connected with fāri фä $\mu$ etc., cf. Fick Et. Wörtb. ${ }^{4} 489$.
hebris 'febris.'
Serv. ad Aen. 7. 695 Febris dicitur quae ante hebris......nam posteritas in multis nominibus F pro H posuit.

## horda (?) bos, Hordicidia ?=forda, Fordicidia.

Varro R. R. 2. 5. 6 Quae sterilis est uacca, taura appellatur; quae praegnas, horda. Ab eo in fastis dies hordicalia (?) nominantur quod tum hordae boues immolantur. But in L. L. 6. 15 we read: Fordicidia a fordis bubus; bos forda quae fert in ventre (and so Ov. Fast. 4. 630). That this variation in Varro's account of the word is genuine appears from the repetition of both these glosses, one with $f$ - the other with $h$ - in Paul. ex F. pp. 83 and 102 M. The form forda is given also by minor glossographers, e.g. Plac. p. 463 Mai.
${ }^{1}$ Stolz in J. Müller's Handb. ${ }^{2}$ p. 296, had not faced this difficulty, but he has escaped the confusion of the two classes in his Hist. Lat. Gr. (1894) p. 289; the second class is not mentioned at all in Brugmann's Grundriss. It is clear at least that in this class the variation between $h$ - and $f$ - is not due to any variation of phonetic conditions, and is therefore presumably as much dialectic as the first class (excluding $f u$-).
${ }^{2}$ With two other still more doubtful examples.
forbeam 'antiqui genus omne cibi appellabant quam Graeci $\phi \circ \rho \beta \eta{ }_{\eta} \nu$ uocant' Paul. ex F. 84 M.
If this word is (1) not borrowed from the Greek (= $=\phi \circ p \beta a i ̂ a n$. pl. ?) but (2) closely connected with herba, and (3) if both are akin to Gr. $\phi \epsilon \rho \beta \omega$ and O. Norse bergja 'to taste, try' as Fick suggests (Et. Wtb. ${ }^{4}$ p. 492), then forbea must be the true Latin form, which has dropped out of use, and herba is an intruder.
horcto-=forcto- 'fortis,' which is commonly (e.g. by Brugm. Gds. 1. § 370 p. 281 Eng.) compared with Skt. dr.dha- 'strong.'

Paul. ex F. 102 M. Horctum et forctum pro bono dicebant (the meaning of forctus is given also pp. 84, 321 and 348 M.).

## 350 Personal Names of Falerii <br> (occurring in pure Latin inscc.).

## A. Frequent.

1. Nomina.

Flauia
Titia
B. Less frequent.

1. Nomina.

| Aconia | Furia | Praecilia |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Annia | Gilitia | \{Quinctia) |
| Antonia | Iulia | \{Quintia $\}$ once each |
| Aurellia (once, and | Luria | Septimia |
| once -elia) | Messia (one insc.) | Stertinia |
| Creuentia | Numisia cf. inf. | Villia $l$. |
| Decia | Nummia | Volumnia |
| Egnatia cf. sup. | Pontia |  |

## 2. Among the Cognomina may be mentioned

Porrus
${ }^{1}$ C. I. L. XI. $3073-3195$, excluding such inscc. as appear above among the
Faliscan.

|  | C. Once only. |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | 1. Nomina. |  |
|  | Fuluia |  |
| Albia | Herennia inf. | Selia |
| Ammia | Iunia sup. | Sempronia |
| Aquinia | Liuia cf. sup. | (Setoriana) |
| Atilia | Lucilia | Sulpicia |
| Auillia | Mammia | Tintoria |
| Caluentia | Maria | Tirria |
| Cincia | Nigrinia | Titien[a] |
| Claudia | Oliana) | Tullia |
| Cornelia | Oppia | Tutilia |
| Cremut[ia] | Papinia $l$. | (Vestiniana) |
| Curtia | Plotidia | Veturia |
| Floronia $l$. |  | Vibulena |
|  |  |  |

## 2. Among the Cognomina.

Daphnus
Pollio
Rufus

## 351 Place-names ${ }^{1}$ in Etruria.

A. Well attested in form, date and locality.

Etrusci, Etruria, Tusci, all cl. inscc., cf. Umb. Turskum. Kiepert, Lehrb. d. Alten Geogr. p. 401, gives Etrusia as an older form, but I cannot find any authority for it. Toscána.
Tyrrhēni, -ēnus, Tup解, Tvpo- cl. The name they used themselves acc. to Dion. Hal. 1.30 was 'Pađévpa (al. ééva).
[Saxa Rubra cl., also Rubrae.]
[ad Gallinas cl.]
${ }^{1}$ For the notation see the List of Signs and Abbreviations. Many of these names are obviously Italic in origin, but the personal names of Etruria stand on a different footing, and these I have not included; cf. p. 389 footn.

Alsǐum, -iensis (poet. -sius, -a, -um) cl. inscc., lacus Alsietinus, Frontin. Aquaed. 11.

Frĕgēnae cl.
Crĕmĕra fl., -ensis cl.
V $\bar{e} 1 i($ disyll.), Veiens, -entanus cl. inscc.
[Aquae Tauri, Aquenses Taurini cl.]
[Centum Cellae first in Pl. Ep. 6. 31, al.]
[Castrum Nouum, -onouani cl. insce.]
(Caerĕ indecl. neut. (Kaîpe, Katpéa, Kaıpף́) cl.; Caerēs, -rētis cl., -rı̆tis cl., insc., Caerētanus (Cere-, Caera-) cl. inscc. Cervéteri.

Ăgylla, -llaei, -llini, the older name of Caere cl.
Sabata Stra. 5. 2. 9,-batinus cl. inscc. Sābātĭa stagna Sill 8. 490, Tribus Sabatina cl. inscc.
Mĭnīō fl. cl. Mignóne f.
Grăviscae, -canus cl. inscc.
[Pyrgi, -gensis cl., a Greek vase-factory on the shore near Caere.]
Tarquĭnı̌i (-kvióo,-кvvía,-kovivat), -nienses cl. inscc. Rócca Turchinna and Corneto Tarquinia.
Blera, -ani (Bג $\eta^{\prime}$ ) cl. inscc. Blaera C. I. L. vi. 3645. Bieda.
Sutrĭum, -rinus cl. inscc. (Sūtrĭa tecta Sil. 8. 491). Sutri.
Căpēna, -nas cl. inscc. (-ēnus Verg. Aen. 7. 697 and Lib. Col., lucus Capenatis Cato Fragm. 30).
Fērōnĭae lucus cl., colonia Julia Felix Lucoferonensium inscc. On the exact site of this temple see Deecke Fal. § 19 p .57 ff . Feronia was a Faliscan goddess, and we find a town named after her in Sardinia. The semi-Falisc. insc. ( 335 sup.) is written by settlers in Sardinia who presumably lived in this very town.
Sōractĕ mons neut. cl. (Saur- Cat. ap. Varr. R.R. R. 2. 3. 3), called mons Hirpinorum by Serv. ad Aen. 11. 785, but v. Hirpi infr. C. M. Soratte.
Nepete neut. Liv. inscc. Nepet Pl. 3. 5. 52, v. Prisc. 6. 4. 22; $-\pi i \tau a$ Stra.; - $\pi \epsilon \tau a$ Ptol.; Nepe Tab. P., Vell. Pat. 1. 14, later insce.; Nĕpĕsīnus cl. inscc., ef. Bormann C. I. L. xi. p. 481. Nèpi.
Cĭmĭnǐus L., Ciminia silva cl. insec. M. Cimino.
 Varro L．L．5．162，Macrob．Sat．1．9． 13 and Tab．Peut．；it is now Civita Castellana．At 4 miles distance in the plain lies
Falerii（noui）or Municipium Faliscum，built 241－239，be－ coming after 42 b．c．colonia Iunonia Falisca Etruscorum cl．insc．Fälleri is the local name for the ruins，but the adjacent village is known officially as Faléria．
Fălisci Фа入íкои cl．inscc．${ }^{2}$ ．
Aequum Făliscum，－qui Fălisci＝Falerii noui，Verg．A．7． 695 al． For the connexion of the name with Hălēsus see 349 Rem．sup．
Fescennia，－nninus cl．（Фarkévıov Dion．Hal．1．21）．
Horta or Hortae Itinn．Orta，－ani inscc．Hortanum Pl． 3. 5．52．Örte．
Vadimon lacus．＇Oá $\delta \mu \nu \nu$ cl．
Volci ov̉ó̀кo兀（＂O入кıov Steph．Byz．）；Volcentes，cl．insc．；－centani Pl．，insc．Piano di Voci（K．）．
Tuscana C．I．L．vi． 2379 a．v．49，Itinn．，－anenses C．I．L．xi．2956， －ienses Pl．3．5．52．Toscanella．
Cǒsa－ani cl．inscc．，cf．nm．C．I．L．I． 14 （Cŏsae Verg．Aen．10．168，

［Forum Aurelii Cic．Catil．1． 9 al．］
Igilium insula cl．I．del Giglio．
Statonia－onienses cl．（－ones Pl．3．5．52）．
Fĕrentium，－tienses cl．inscc．（－entinum Pl．3．5． 52 al．）．
［Aquae Passeris，or－erianae Mart．6．42． 6 al．C．I．L．xi．3003．］
＊Visentium；Visens，－entinus inscc．Vesentini Pl．3．5．52． Bisénzio f．
${ }^{1}$ There is no record of the exact boundaries of the Faliscan territory，so that
I have simply included it in Etruria．Deecke，in his careful collection of ancient notices（Die Falisker pp．28－60），enumerates only Falerii，and its cognates，Fescennium（Dion．Hal．1．21），and Soracte（Plin．7．2．§ 19）as definitely called Faliscan；inscc．in Faliscan have been found on the slope of M．Ciminus（mod．Carbognano）and on the site of Capena，while Fla uinium （？inf．B）and Lucus Feroniae are too near to Soracte and Capena respec－ tively to be separated from them．
 ＇Ianvyiq）which E．Lattes Rh．Mus．xurx．（1894）p． 317 regards as an Etrusean－ ised form of Falisci（with－ss－for orig．－sc－as in several Etr．words）．

Větŭlonium cl, -onenses inscc. (-onii -onienses Plin. -ōnia Sil.); nm. Etr. vatl- vetl- Fabr. 288-9.
Caletranus ager cl.
Saturnia, -nini cl. For the older name Aurinia see under C.
Telamon (portus et opp.) cl., nm. Etr. tla- Fabr. 297. Talamóne.
Sorrinenses (novensides), inscc. cf. Bormann C. I. L. xi. p. 454. ? Soriano nel Cimino.
Suana, -neasis Plin. 3. 5. 52 al. Sována.
Planasia insula cl. Pianósa.
$\left\{\begin{array}{l}\text { Aethalia insula cl. (Aïá̀ } \eta \text { Hecataeus ap. Steph. Byz.), also called } \\ \text { Ilva cl. Élba. }\end{array}\right.$
Voltumnae fanum Liv. 4. 23 al.
Volsǐnǐi or Vuls-, -iniensis ${ }^{1}$, both cl. and inscc., nm. Etr. velsu Müll.-Deecke I. p. 386. Lago di Bolséna.
Rusellae, -anus cl.
Pŏpŭlōnium, -nenses cl. (-ōnĭa poet.), nm. Etr. pupluna Fabr. 291 f.; cf. Juno Populonia, and Keller Lat. Volksetym. p. 13.
[Praefectura Claudia, Forum Clodi, oclodienses Pl. 3. 5. 52, inscc.]
Clănis fl cl. (Gla- Plin. and Steph. Byz.). Val di Chiána.
Clūsium, -inus, -inas cl. inscc. Chírsi.
Pĕrŭsia, -ŭsinus cl, inscc. Perugia.
 original form of the first syllable according to Quint. Inst. 1. 5. 13), cf. Keller Lat. Volksetym. p. 13. Trasiméno.
Cortona, -nenses cl. inscc. (Kрór由у Dion. Hal. 1. 29, and, acc. to Niebubr, Herod. 1. 57). Cortóna.
Saena (Julia), -nensis cl., inscc. Sièno.
Capraria insula cl., -asia Varr. R. R. 2. 3. 3. 'Graeci Aegilion dixere' Plin. Capráia.
Volaterrae, -anus cl. inscc., nm. Etr. velathri Fabr. no. 303, cf. Keller Lat. Volkset. p. 13. Voltérra.
Arrētium, -tinus cl. inscc. Arézzo.
Urgo insula ('O $\rho \gamma \omega \bar{\nu}$ ) cl., later Gorgon. Gorgóna.

[^91]Arnus fl. cl. Tribus Arnensis insec. Amof.

Auser fl. cl. (Stra. Al̈adp, Auserculus mediaev. K.). Sérchio f., Val dn Oseri (Dict. Corog.).
Faesulae, -anus cl. inscc. (-ŭla Sill. 8. 477,-ó̀a, -ov̂̀ac). Fiúsole. [Florentia, -ntini cl. inscc. Fireñze.]
Umbro fl. cl. Ombróne f.
Lūca, -censis cl. insce. Lácca.
Pistoriae inscc., Itinn., -riu m Plin.; -pía Ptol.; -riensis cl. Pistòio.
Luna,-nenses cl. insce. Lúni (Dante).
Macra fl. cl. Mágra f.

## B. Less certain.

Mucia prata trans Tiberim Liv. 2. 13. al.
Lorium, Laur- Itinn., Fronto.
Careiae Itinn., Fronto.
Baccanae It. Anton. p. 286, Vaca- Tab. P. Baccana.
Tromentus campus Paul. p. 367 M., Tromentina tribus inscc., Liv.
6. 5 al., but its exact position is unknown.

Tutia f. Liv. 26.11 (v. Weissenb. ad loc.), Sil. 13. 5, mediaev. Tuzia.
Flāuīna Sil. 8. 490, -inĭa arvà Verg. Aen. 7. 695.
[Forum Cassi Tab. Peut.]
Aqua Vegetiana (belonging to a certain Valerius
Vegetus)

Fundi Volsonianus
Cuttolonianus
Serranus
C. I. L. XI. 3003.

Stellatina tribus cl. inscc., cf. Liv. 6. 5, ? cf. - nus campus near Capua, Fest. p. 343 M.
Sudernum? Ptol. 3. 1. 43, cf. vitis Tudernis (Tuscis peculiaris est)
Pl. 14. 3. 36, and Etrusc. nomen Thania Sudernia Fabr. 285 and 958.
*Subertum, -bertani Liv. 26. 3 al. Suveréto.
[Manliana (eastra ?) Ptol. 3. 1. 43, Tab. Peut. cf. Sall. Cat. 32.]
Dianium insula Pl. 3. 6. 81 al. Giannutri.

Falesia Portus (not -èria) It. Anton. p. 501, cf. Zumpt ad Rutil. Itin. 1. 371. Mediaeval Falesia (Dict. Corog.).

Prille fl. Plin. 3. 8. 2, Prelius or Pril- Cic. Mit. § 74, Aprilis It. Anton. p. 500.
Camars older name of Clusium (supr. A), Liv. 10. 25 ; cf. Roman cogn. Camars, C. I. L. vr. 449.
$\left\{\begin{array}{l}\text { Portus Labronis Cic. ad Q. Frat. 2. 6. 3, It. Ant. p. 292, also called } \\ \text { [Herculis portus Stra. 5. 2. 8 al.] }\end{array}\right.$
Caecina f. Pl. 3. 5. 50. Mel. 2. 4. 9. Cf. Etr. nomen Ceicna Fabr. 2319. Cecina f. Cécŭna, Dante, Inf. 13. 10 Tra Cecina e Corneto, i luoghi colti. [W. R.]

## C. Doubtful.

Alma fl. It. Anton.
Tpaúбıov $\pi \epsilon$ סíon? near Caere? Diod. Sic. 14. 107. 6.
Bebiana Tab. P. -beina It. Rav.
Amitinenses Pl. 3. 5. 52.
Oscus locus in agro Veienti Fest. p. 189 M.
Hirpi in Faliscorum agro (fire-leapers) Pl. 7. 2. 19, Hirpini Varr. ap. Serv. Aen. 11. 787, cf. his note on 785.
Punicum Tab. P. (a Carthaginian vase factory according to Kiep. Alte Geogr. p. 411).
Armenita Tab. P. Arnine It. Anton.
[Fossae Papirianae Itinn. near Pisa.]
Contenebra et Cortuosa Liv. 6. 4.
Castellum Amerinum Tab. P. cf. Plin. Ep. 10. 20.
[Aquae Apollinares Itinn.]
Axia Cic. Caec. 7. ? Castel d' Ásso.
Algae near Centumcellae It. Anton., p. 498 Wess.
Marta Itinn., Marta Fl. Tab. P.
Pallia fl. Tab. P. Páglia f.
Herbanum Pl. 3. 5. 52.
Maternum Itinn. ? Mitino.
Anneianum It. Ant.
Regis uilla Stra. 5. 2. 8.

Matrini uicus Tab. P.
Oglasa (or -osa ?) insula P1. 3. 6. 80 -ossa Mart. Capella § 644 p. 526.
Columbaria Veneria (or-aria ?) insula Pl. 3. 6. 81 al. (Jahn regards
C. and V. as distinct islands).

Barpana? insula Pl. 3. 6. 81.
Menaria? ibid. (Veneria Mart. Cap. § 644 p. 527).
Saccumum Amm. Mart. 17. 7. 13, near lacus Ciminius, by some corrected to Sucinium to match the ethnicon Suciniensis in an insc. from N. Etruria ${ }^{1}$.

Trossulum Pl. 33. 9. 35 al., cf. Paul. ex F. p. 367 Muiller, ?=Troilum Liv. 10. 46.
[Polimartium Paul. Diac. Hist. Langobard. 4. 8. Bomárzo.]
Albinia fl. Tab. P. Albégna $f$.
Loretanus portus? Liv. 30. 39.
A urini older name of Saturnini (v. A supr.), Pl. 3. 5. 52.
Salpinates Liv. 5. 31.
[Argentarius mons opposite to Igilium Rutil. Itin. 1. 315.]
Massa Veternensis Ammian. Marc. 14. 11. 27.
[ad Herculem Ptol. 3. 1. 4, Itinn.]
Auentia f. Tab. P. Avenza opp. (Vogel).
ad Joglandem? Tab. P. ?Ciggiano.
Teutanes quidam graece loquentes, inhabitants of Pisa before the Etruscans, Cato ap. Serv. Dan. Aen. 10. 179.
Biturgia Ptol. 3. 1. 43 -urza Tab. P.
Aquileia Ptol. 3. 1. 43, Tab. P.
${ }^{2} \mathrm{H} \beta a$ Ptol. 3. 1. 43 ?
B $\iota \rho \alpha ́ \kappa \epsilon \lambda \lambda o \nu$ Ptol. 3. 1. 43.

Mensulae Tab. P., It. An. Rav. 4. 36.
ad Solaria Tab. P.
Vesidia Tab. P. cf. deus Visidianus 368 B inf.
[Villa Triturrita Tab. P., Rutil. It. 1. 527.]
1 The ref. given is Giorn. Pisa xvr. 147 which I have not been able to find, but the insc., if genuine, will be easily traced when C. I. L. XI. is complete.
D. Further modern names.

Farnèta, Èlsa F., Nárce, Cetona, Farma F., Tresa F., Cintoia, Foiáno della Chiana, Asciano, Savino M., Fine F., Arbia F., Ambra F., Greve F., Levanella, Pesa F., Era F., Cascina F'., Siève F., Bientina L., Falteróna M., Scarperia, Pizzorne, Carrára.

## VI. Umbrian.

According to tradition the Umbrians were the most ancient tribes in Italy of the Italic stock (Plin. 3. § 112), and by the Greeks of the V century b.c. the name ' $\mathrm{O} \mu \beta$ рıк $\eta$ ' is applied to the whole of central and northern Italy (e.g. Herodt. 1. 94, 4. 49). The tradition of their conquest by the Etruscans (e.g. Plin. and Herodt. ll.cc.) is placed beyond a doubt by the numerous place-names in Etruria (see 351) of Italic origin, and by the fact that it was the Etruscans who taught them the arts of writing ${ }^{1}$ and coinage, not to speak of other archaeological evidence ${ }^{2}$ as to the intercourse between the two races. Even the territory on the east of the Tiber in which they held their ground longer was largely taken from them by the Picentines (p. 449 inf.) and the Gauls (e.g. Plin. l.c.) who between them shut off the Umbrians proper from all access to the sea.

It was not until it was too late, at the end of the great Samnite War, that the Umbrians offered any aid to their Samnite kindred in the struggle with Rome, and their own conquest by the Romans may be counted as complete in 299 B.c. when the colony of Narnia ${ }^{3}$ was founded; their last resistance was crushed by the battle of Sentinum in 295. The Via Flaminia, built in 220 b.c. produced an important division between the status of eastern and western Umbria. Beloch (It. Bund p. 56 ff.) has

[^92]pointed out that all the towns along the left bank of the Tiber in a narrow strip of territory reaching from Narnia to the ager Gallicus were in the last century B.c. included in the Clustumine tribe, one of the eight which as he has shown (ib. p. 40) were made to include all the Italian communities which joined in the revolt of $90 \mathrm{~B} . \mathrm{C}$. ; in this strip of territory lie Interamna Nahartium, Ameria, Carsulae, Tuder, Vettona, Arna, Iguvium, Tifernum Tiberinum, Sestinum, Sassina and Uruinum Mataurense. Now this uniformity contrasts remarkably with the great diversity of tribe among the communities of the eastern half along the via Flaminia and it can hardly be doubted that Beloch is correct in inferring that down to 90 b.c. all the towns just enumerated were independent allies of Rome. We know this directly of Iguvium (Cic Balb. § 47), Tuder (Sisenna fr. 119 Peter) and others. On the other hand it seems probable from various evidence that the whole length of the via Flaminia ran through Roman or Latin territory right up to the state domain known as the ager Gallicus; Spoletium was a Latin colony (241 B.c.), Fulginia a municipium (Cic. fr. Varen. 4); and Asisium must have received the civitas before the Social War, since we find its chief magistrates called by the local name marones even after that date (C. I. L. XI. 5390 quoted 355 inf.) whereas in all municipia which were established after that, the old titles were abolished in favour of the Duovirate or Quattuorvirate ; the same consideration applies to Fulginia (354 inf.).

Hence there seems no reason for supposing that the local dialect died out in the western or independent half of Umbria before the Social War, and the $a \beta$ of several of the inscc. (see below) belongs distinctly to the Gracchan or Sullan period. Note xlii, an insc. from Spoleto, is mainly Latin, but shows the influence of Umbrian in one or two forms. I have collected under the 'Umbrian Glosses' ( 368 inf.) a considerable number of non-Latin forms that appear in the Latin inscc. of Umbria. In this section and elsewhere I owe a great deal to the kindness of Prof. Bormann, who sent me the proof-sheets of C. I. L. XI. Pt. ii., which is not yet published, though I have added references to it.

## Note xlii. Inscription of Spoleto.

C. I. L. xi. ${ }^{4} 766$, Bücheler Rh. Mus. 1880 p. 626. Found in 1879, and now in the municipal picture gallery. Forms showing marks of Umbrian influence are printed in heavy type; underlinings denote as usual injury to the stone.
honce loucom | nequs uiolatod | neque exuehito neq|ue | exferto $5,6,7$ quod louci|siet, neque cedito|nesei quo die res delina|anua

8,9 fiet; eod die $\mid q u o d$ rei dinai cau|sa|f]iat, sine dolo ced|re| 10-13 [1]icetod. seiquis | ulolasit, ioue bou|id | piaclum datod, | seiquis 14-16 scies | uiolasit, dolo ml|o|iouei bouid piaclu|m|datod et a. CCC| 17-19 moltai suntod. | eius piacli moltaique dictator|ei] exactio est[od].

Where the end of a line came in the middle of a word, the engraver often finished the word on the side of the stone, e.g. l. 6 ends with de, and ina is round the corner. Spoletium became a Latin colony in 241 (Vell. 1.14.8, Liv. Epit. 20), and this insc. was probably written not long after that date.

## 352-3 Tuder.

This town was an independent ally of Rome (striking coins of its own, 368 inf.), until it received the citizenship in the Social War (Sisenna ap. Non. II. s.v. iusso p. 130 Merc.). It is first mentioned for a prodigy in 103 B.c. (e.g. Plin. H. N. 2. $\S 138$ ), and then as being taken in 83 by Crassus, who é $\delta o \xi \epsilon$ $\pi \lambda \epsilon \hat{\imath} \sigma \tau a \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \chi \rho \eta \mu a ́ \tau \omega \nu \sigma \phi \epsilon \tau \epsilon \rho i \sigma a \sigma \theta a \iota$ (Plut. Crass. 6). It was colonised by the Triumvirs or Augustus (Plin. 3. § 113) and called colonia Iulia Fida Tuder. For further details see C.I. L. XI. p. 678 f.

For the Gallic insc. of Tuder see the Appendix.

352 In Umbr. $\alpha \beta$ on the breast plate of a bronze warrior in the Museo Gregoriano at Rome where I saw it in April 1894. Büch. Umb. p. 174 from Aufr.-Kirch. taf. 9.

353 On tiles found at Tuder, now in the Museum at Pesaro. Buich. Umb. p. 174, from Aufr.-Kirch. taf. 10 e, f, $g$, h. ( $a$ ), (b) and (c) are in Lat. $\alpha \beta$ from 1. to r., $(d)$ in Etr. $a \beta$ from r. to 1 .

$$
\begin{array}{cc}
a . & \text { ma puplece } \\
\text { b. } & \text { ca puple|ce ma fel } \\
c . & \text { tupleia pu|plece } \\
\text { d. } & \text { la ma tvpei }
\end{array}
$$

## 354-354 bis Inscriptions of Fulginia.

354 On a bronze tablet found near Fulginia and now lost; Büch. Umb. p. 173 from Jordan, Quaest. Umbricae (Königsberg 1882) p. 4. In Lat. $\alpha \beta$ of Gracchan period. For the status of Fulginia see above p. 396.
cubrar matrer bio eso $\mid$ oseto cisterno $n \subset \downarrow \vee \mid$ su maronato $111 /$ u l uarie | t c fulonie

354 bis On a block of limestone $\cdot 52 \mathrm{~m}$. high, $\cdot 34 \mathrm{~m}$. broad, found in a field near Foligno, where it now is in the picture-gallery. Lat. a $\alpha \beta$ 'litteris uetustis,' Mommsen apud Bormann C. I. L. xi. 5207, whence the text.
supunne | sacr

## 355 Inscription of Asisium.

Found in 1742 between Assisi and la Bastia, now in the Museum of the University of Perugia, where Bormann transcribed it, C. I. L. xI. 5389. Also Aufrecht and Kirchhoff ri. p. 389 taf. ix.
ager emps et $\mid$ termnas oht $\mid c u$ uistinie ner $t$ babr, | maronatei | uois ner propartie | t u uoisiener; | sacre stahu

On limestone block in Latin $\alpha \beta$ which appears to be of the Sullan period; single interp. 1. 3 is rather crowded. Compare the Lat. insc. C. I. L. xI. 5390 :

Post. Mimesius C. f., T. Mimesius Sert. f., Ner. Capidas C. f. Ruf., Ner. Babrius T. f., C. Capidas T. f. C. n., V. Volsienus T. f. marones murum ab
fornice ad circum et fornicem cisternamq. $d(e) s($ enatus $) s($ ententia $)$ faciundum coiravere.

For the status of Asisium see above p. 396.
Bücheler Umbrica p. 172.

## 356-367 Tabulae Iguvinae.

But little mention of Iguvium is made by Latin writers. It was chosen as the place of captivity for the pirate-king Gentius in 167 b.c. (Liv. 4Ј. 43). Cicero (Balb. c. 21, § 47) mentions the treaty by which it was bound to Rome, down to the Social War; at that epoch it must have received full Roman citizenship since we find it included in the tribus Clustumina (C. I. L. XI. 5838 al., cf. p. 396 sup.), and in Caesar (B. Civ. 1. 12) it is called a municipium. From this passage we learn that it was occupied for Caesar on his march south ( 49 B.c.) by Curio, cf. Cic. Att. 7. 13 (13 b) § 7. Pliny (23. § 95) mentions a herbal oil which the Iguvians sold to travellers on the Via Flaminia. Of the Latin inscc. (C. I. L. xı. $5803-5926$ ) two or three are of Augustan date, but none seem to be earlier.

The only priest mentioned in the Latin inscc. of Iguvium is L. Veturius Rufio auispex extispecus,sacerdos publicus et priuatus, ib. 5824.

These celebrated tables were discovered at Gubbio in 1444, bought by the municipality in $1456^{1}$, and they are still preserved in the town-hall. A Dominican, Leandro Alberti ${ }^{2}$ (Descrizione d' Italia 1550) states that they were originally nine in number, and he is confirmed by an independent authority Antonio Concioli (Statuta civitatis Eugubii, 1673) who states that two were taken to Venice in 1540 and never re-appeared. The existing seven were first published in an accurate but largely mistaken transcript by Buonarotti in 1724, as an Appendix to Dempster's De Etruria Regali.

[^93]The first real advance towards their interpretation was made by Otfried Müller (Die Etrusker, 1828), who pointed out that though their $a \beta$ was akin to the Etruscan, their language was Italic.

Lepsius finally determined the value of the Umbrian signs and the received order of the Tables, pointing out that those in Latin $a \beta$ were the latest; in his essay De Tabulis Eugubinis ${ }^{1}$, 1833. He subsequently published what may be called the editio princeps in 1841. The first edition with a full commentary based on scientific principles was that of Aufrecht and Kirchhoff in 1849-51, and on this all subsequent interpretations are based (Bréal, Paris 1875, Bücheler, Umbrica, Bonn 1883, a reprint and enlargement of articles in Fleckeisen's Jahrbuch 1875 pp. 127, 313).

The text, which is everywhere perfectly legible, I have taken from the photographs of the Marquis Ranghiasci-Brancaleone, published with Bréal's edition.

## Chronology of the Tables.

## 1. Their relative dates.

At least four periods in the history of the dialect can be distinguished in the records we have left to us, by the help of the successive changes ( $a$ ) in alphabet and (b) in language, which the tables exhibit.

> a. Changes in Alphabet.

We have first the broad distinction that Tables I, II, III and IV, and the first two inscriptions of $V$ are in Umbrian characters: the Latin alphabet is used in the Clauerniur paragraph (V iii), and the whole of VI ( $a$ and $b$ ) and VII ( $a$ and $b$ ).

What we may call the normal Umbrian $\alpha \beta$ (in which e.g. Table I $a$ is written), consists of the following signs, the writing being always from right to left:

[^94]$A a, g b, 9 d$ (i.e. a sound akin to $r$ derived from $d$ ), $\lambda e, \lambda v$,
 $\vee u$ and $o, 8 f$, d $\grave{s}$ (i.e. a voiceless palatal consonant).

In the Latin $\alpha \beta$, in which Tables VI and VII and the third inscription of Table $V$ are written, $d$ is represented by RS, $g$ by $\mathrm{C}_{1}$ but $k$ by ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, d$ by $\mathrm{D}, t$ by $\mathrm{T}, v$ and $u$ by $\vee$ but $o$ by $\mathrm{O}, \stackrel{s}{ }$ by S , though the diacritic is often omitted. The interpunct is double with the Umbrian $\alpha \beta$, single and medial with the Latin.

Tables VI and VII, then, and V iii, were written later than the rest. But even in the earlier group certain variations appear.

The latest form of the Umbrian $a \beta$ is that of Table V i and ii. Here $e$ and $v$ have their hastae nearly or quite upright $(3,1) ; t$ has no part of its cross to the right ( $y$ instead of $f$ ); the loop of $r$ is broad ( $\mathbf{O}$ ); $a$ tends to curl its left foot outwards ( $A$ ), making a distinct bend in the middle of the left-hand stroke; specially characteristic of Table V are the abbreviated form of $m(\wedge)$ and the strictly angular and undivided form of $k$ ( $x$, not $\gg$ or $\supset$ ).

Nearest to this is the $a \beta$ of Tables III and IV (which form cnly a single document, since a sentence is split between them and neither is engraved on the back). Here $e$ and $v$, though not upright, are far more regular than they frequently are in Tables I and II; their bars are nearly always parallel and join the hasta at a genuine angle. $\supset$ or $\rangle$ is nearly always 'separate'; $y$ is the common form of $t$, sometimes + , but $\Varangle$ is rare, and only $y(\operatorname{not} \neq)$ is used for $z$; $r$ is fairly broad $(\mathbf{0}), a$ often curls its left foot, and $m$ and $n$ generally slope towards the left, with no true verticals ( $M, N$ ).

Tables I and II have always $\boldsymbol{\tau} \boldsymbol{\pm}, \mathcal{A}$, and in $e$ and $v$ the hasta and bottom bar (sometimes the top bar also) are continually rounded into a curve, and in $e$ the middle bar often joins the hasta at the same point as the lowest ( $\gamma, \eta, j$ and even $\gamma)$; in

[^95]both I and II $k$ is only occasionally 'separate.' Between Table I (whose two sides make up only a single document, as appears e.g. from their repetition in Tables VI and VII) and II $a$ and II $b$ the differences in writing are far smaller, and Lepsius counted the three documents as contemporaneous. In Table I the hastae of $n$ and $m$ are regularly vertical and of the same height, while in II $a$ and II $b$ they vary in height and are often out of the perpendicular. In Table I, more than in any other of the seven, $s$ is regularly rounded in both halves; the loop of $r$ is much the same as in Tables III and IV, whereas in II $a$ and $b$ the prevailing form is decidedly narrower ( 0 ). Finally in II $a 18$ and 24 we have the archaic letter $\operatorname{san}(M=s)$ of the abecedaria (Roberts Int. Gr. Epig. pp. 17 ff.) which appears in no other Italic nor in any Chalcidian inse., though it survived longer in Etruscan use, often in the form $\bowtie$ (cf. p. 94 sup. and the Appendix). Against this may be set the use of $\odot=\theta$ for $t$ in $I b 1$, but this appears also in IV 20 and may therefore perhaps be less of an archaism. These characteristics of II $a$ and $b$ would be in themselves far too slight to prove an earlier date, but they have perhaps some weight as confirming the evidence of the language, to which we now come.

## b. Changes in language.

The evidence of date derived from changes in the language is more difficult to formulate and establish, and the enquiry calls for the most diligent use of scientific method and critical judgment. Its intricacy lies in the character of the documents before us,-religious formularies consisting partly of matter established in usage long before they were written down in their present shape, partly of additions made at the time of writing. A crucial example of this is furnished by the expansion and modernisation of the subject-matter of Table I into Tables VI and VII $a$. Hence we frequently meet with forms which had passed out of the language that was spoken at the time they were engraved, side by side with their equivalents in that language; and the writers of the different Tables have been influenced in varying degrees by the opposite tendencies
of modernisation and archaism and in no case are perfectly consistent. Hence a phonetic change may have come about in the spoken language some time before any trace of it appears in the Tables; but on the other hand it is clear that its first appearance in the Tables proves that it had taken effect in the spoken language.

Further study of the dialect will bring into clearer light the many differences between its older and younger stages and assign them to specific epochs. Here it is proper to mention only three such divergences, which have long been recognised. The first is certainly a purely phonetic change, and the second probably so; the third may owe much of its apparent domain to analogical extension.

1. The change of the guttural explosives to palatal spirants before $i, e$, and consonant $i$.
2. The change of an original ${ }^{1}$ final $-\bar{a}$ to -0 (written $-u$ in Umb. $a \beta$ ).
3. The change of an original final $-s$ to $-r$ after a vowel.

Whether these changes came about in one or more periods of the spoken language is a question of grammar ${ }^{2}$; the epigraphist, in the first instance at least, is only concerned with the fact that they undoubtedly appear for the first time at successive stages in the text of the inscriptions. In the language as the inscc. present it we may now distinguish four periods.

1. The first period is represented simply by the oldest forms in III and IV, which show none of the three changes, viz. kukehes, kebu, Pupdikes, -ke (5 times) beside Pupdses, -is̀e (once each).

On kukehes, as on cehefi (VI $a 20$ ) and Akedunia- (I b, VI and VII), it is unsafe to lay stress until we know its meaning and original vocalism. But kebu

[^96]corresponds exactly to Lat. cilurs and even if the forms -kes, -ke are not themselves older than the palatal change, yet the variation with -s.- at least suggests that that change was recent at the time when the formulae were written down; since vuke (III), Naharcer, -ce (VI and VII), fratreci (VII b), todceir (VI a) prove that the - $\delta$ - forms were ultimately levelled out of the declensions by the influence of the cases in which $k$ was preserved before o- (curnase once (VI $a$ ) beside curnacom (ib.) and pase (VI and VII) which occurs only in the ablative are the only later exceptions). Elsewhere (teitu $={ }^{*}$ deicetod, s̀ihs̀eda etc.) III and IV show the palatals regularly.
2. The second period appears in II $b$, which is very possibly an original document, since its spelling shows no such inconsistencies as we find in III and IV, I and II $\alpha$. At the beginning of this period, that is, in the language of II $b$, the changes of the gutturals and final $-\bar{\alpha}$ have come about, but there is no trace of the change of final $s$ to $r$. Now III and IV are untouched by the last two changes, but they show the first with the variations just noticed. II $a$ again, (1) writes the palatals consistently, (2) varies between final $-a$ and $-u,(3)$ shows no trace of final rhotacism. These inconsistencies can only be explained by supposing that the documents before us are either copies made in this second period from older documents and incompletely modernised (whether by intention or accident) in copying, or documents composed in this period and intentionally but only incompletely archaized. Since from the $\alpha \beta$ of III and IV it would seem that they were written later than II and yet they show uniformly $-a$, their archaism seems intentional ${ }^{1}$. In II $a$ a distinction must be made between the first paragraph (Il. 114358 inf .) and the rest ( $359 \mathrm{inf}$. .). In the first there are seven examples of $-u$ and none of $-a$; in the rest there are at least seventeen of $-a$ to only three of $-u$ (all together in l.34). The first paragraph therefore is on a level with II $b$ and may be original ; in the second, which, it is to be noticed, ends with the same formula as Table I, the modernising appears accidental.
3. V i and ii , in which final $s$ has everywhere become $r$, give us the third period. Table I is a copy or re-draft made from older documents during this period. This is shown by the

[^97]occasional appearance of $r$ instead of final $s$ and the prevailing use of final $-a$ (thirteen examples) instead of final $-u$ (three examples down to $\mathrm{I} b 10$ ). Final $-u$ however is invariable in the last paragraph beginning at I $b 10$ ( 357 inf .), but since the Table is uniform in writing, and this last paragraph shows also final -r occasionally, the discrepancy itself points to the whole being a copy. The palatals are regular ${ }^{1}$, so that we need not assume that the original documents from which Table I was copied or re-drafted were older than the second period.
4. Probably soon after the dialect had reached its latest form the Latin Alphabet was adopted.

VI and VII $a$ contain in an expanded form the same regulations as Table I. Bréal (p. 225) supposed that Table I was an abridged, and VI and VII a complete but modernised copy of one older document. But it seems more probable from the general consistency of VI and VII in the use of the latest form of the dialect, as well as from the history of other religious liturgies, that the fuller and more precise form of the ceremonial regulations was first drawn up in the later period. V iii and VII $b$ probably date from the same time as VI and VII $a$.

The Tables therefore may be provisionally classified as follows:

1. Written in the second period: II $b$, II $a$ (i and ii), III and IV.

Of these there is ground for believing that II $a$ ii, III and IV do not fully represent the language of the period, but follow more or less the model, if not the text, of older documents.
2. Written in the third period: I and V i and ii.

Of these it is clear that I is copied from older documents, with a degree of faithfulness somewhat varying in its two different parts ( $a 1-b 14$ and $b 15-45$ ).

1 The coins with Ikwin- ( 369 inf .), and the Latin and the modern forms of the name (Iguvium, mediaev. Eugubium, Gubbio) appear to me to show that the spellings Iiwvi- (Tab. I and III), Iiovi-, Ioui- (VI and VII) do not represent a real phonetic change at all. I believe that it is nothing more or less than a pious fraud of the priests in order to connect the name of the town with Jove himself and his satellite deities (Tursa Iouia etc.). The spelling Iiouie for a deity (VI B 35) may be regarded as betraying a belief in the identity of the local and divine names.
3. Written in the fourth period: V iii, VI and VII $a$ and $b$.

Of these it is clear that VI and VII $a$ are an amplified and modernised re-draft of the contents of Table I.

It is probable that further research will amend and extend this classification in detail, but its main lines we may, I think, regard as generally accepted. Under these circumstances it is with some hesitation that I have decided for convenience of reference to print the Tables in their received order; the more willingly, however, in that the parallelism of Tables I and VI renders the first easier to interpret than those which must have preceded it had the chronological order been followed.

## 2. Actual date of the Tables.

Here it is impossible as yet to do more than indicate wide and vague limits. The Latin $a \beta$ of V iii, VI and VII might have beelu used at any time between 100 and 50 b.c.; it would be difficult to point out any very definite indications of date to separate it from that of the Tabula Bantina (on the Oscan side, which I take to be the younger, see p . 23) on the one hand, or that of the Lex Rubria ( 49 b.c.) on the other, both of these being, like the Umbrian tables, engraved on bronze. Double consonants are not used at all in V iii, only occasionally in VI and VII $a$, and not universally (panupei) even in VII $b$; in a Latin insc. this would point rather to the Gracchan than to the Sullan period, but we cannot transfer a Roman date to Umbria without some allowance for provincial backwardness. We have seen (p. 396) no reason to doubt that Umbrian was still spoken at least down to the Social War, and it is quite likely that it was the closer relations with Rome which then began that led to the adoption of the Latin $a \beta$ even for religious purposes. This would give us 90 b.c. as a lower limit of date for at least the Tables written in Umbrian $a \beta$.

To begin at the other extreme, we can hardly go back beyond the fifth century B.C. at the beginning of which (p. 312 sup.) the Romans and at the end of which the Campanian Samnites
(p. 143 no. 146) appear to have formed their alphabets; at all events, not until we are able to date the rise and fall of the Etruscan power in its contest with various Italic tribes with some degree of certainty. Since the 'Tuscan name' is denounced in the comprehensive curse of VI $b 53-60$ (cf. Ib 16) we may conclude that Iguvium was independent, but menaced by them in the period in which the curse was first composed. The 'Naharcan name' which stands in the same black list should not be referred (Büch. Umbrica p. 95) to the Roman colony of Narnia founded in 299 b.c., see p. 395 footn. Indeed, as Prof. Ridgeway points out to me, the absence of all mention of either Gauls or Romans seems to point to an earlier date ${ }^{1}$.

## Dimensions of the Tables.

Tables I and II, which are engraved on both sides, measure about 25 in . by 15 ; the letters on I $\alpha$ are about $\frac{9}{16} \mathrm{in}$. high, on I $b$, II $a$ and II $b$ which are more closely engraved only $\frac{3}{8} \mathrm{in}$. Tables III and IV, which are engraved only on one side, measure about 16 in . by 12 , with letters about $\frac{3}{8} \mathrm{in}$. high. Table V measures about 18 in . by 14 ; the Umbrian letters are fully $\frac{1}{2}$ in., the Latin between $\frac{1}{4}$ and $\frac{5}{18}$, both in the Claverniur-paragraph and in VI and VII, save that they are a little larger in VII b. VI and VII both measure about 33 by 22 in .

## Note on the text as printed.

In inscriptions of such length and such frequent difficulty I have thought it desirable to depart from a rule which has been strictly observed in the rest of this edition, so far as to print with capital letters the names of the persons and places that appear to be beyond any reasonable doubt. A certain inconsistency is involved in doing so, as of course there are no such distinctions in the original, and there are a certain number of words of which at present we can only say that they may or may not be proper names, and these cannot reasonably be printed with capitals. But since
${ }^{1}$ Prof. Ridgeway would refer the curse to a period earlier than 400 b.c.; after the Gallic invasion neither Etruscans nor Iapuscans can have been very formidable; the Etruscan power was certainly declining at the end of the V century, see pp. 82, 83, 87, 99 and note [W. R.] that in 414 в.c. (Thuc. 6. 103) they could only send a fleet of three ships to help the Athenians against the ancient enemy of Etruria. These considerations are of great weight, but they lose some of their cogency when applied to a small highland community like Iguvium. In any case the date to be inferred from them refers only to the composition of the curse.
the certain names recur very frequently and it is a great help in interpreting a sentence to be able to identify them at once, it would be, I think, pedantic to desire absolute consistency in the matter. I add a list of the words that are thus treated in the text, warning the reader that the absence of a capital letter in any word does not imply of necessity that it is not a proper name.

The following names are printed with capitals in all the Tables:

| Atiïedio-, -ediati- | Petrunia- |
| :--- | :--- |
| Fisu-, -sio-, -suvio- | Piquier |
| Hunte, Honde | Prestata, -tota |
| Hule | Puemuno- |
| Iapuzko- | Purtupite |
| Ikuvino-, Iirvino-, Iiouino-, Iou- | Sansio-, Sasio- |
| Iupater, Iuv-, Iuvio- | Satane |
| Iuieskanes | Serfo-, Serfio- |
| Casiler, Casilati- | Tadinati- |
| Kastrusio- | Talenate |
| Klavernio- | Tefro- |
| Kluviier | Tlatie |
| Corerio-, Kuretio- | Trebe, -bo |
| Mars, Martio- | Tursa-, Tusa- |
| Museiate | Tursko- |
| Naharko- | Vofone |
| Peiediate | Vusiiza- |
| Peraznanie |  |

Also the following divine epithets, which are half-appellative:

| Ahtu | Pupdiko-, -is̀es etc. |
| :--- | :--- |
| Grabouio-, Krapuvio- | Vestisio- |

Hodio-, Hoio-, Hor'so-
On the other hand the following words which Buicheler, on reasonable but not absolutely certain grounds, prints with capitals, I prefer to leave ambiguous:

```
admune (II b 7)
asetus (II a 14)
speture, -rie (II a 1, 3, 5)
tesenako-
l}\begin{array}{l}{\mathrm{ trellano, -pl-}}\\{\mathrm{ vehio-}}\end{array}}\mathrm{ epithets of the gates of Iguvium
miletinar
noniar
nurpier genitives attached to names of buildings and the like
padellar
rufrer
satier
```

genitives attached to names of buildings and the like in Iguvium, of which some may well be proper names

In punctuation ${ }^{1}$ I have followed Biacheler (who is of course indebted to preceding editors) save where it is otherwise stated.

For archaeological comment on the text the reader may be here referred once for all to Biicheler's admirable edition, where also (as in Bréal's) he will find many more conjectures as to the meaning of obscure words than could be included in the limits of the Glossary to this edition.
${ }^{1}$ As there are no hiatus to be marked in the Tables I have used the punctua-tion-marks corresponding to the type in which the Tables are printed, so that a heavy punct means simply a full stop, not as hitherto a missing letter.

356 Table I $a$-I $b$ line 9.

## Earlier regulations for the lustration of Igwium (cf. 365).

The first three paragraphs are each followed by a line's space left blank; between the fourth and fifth a short line runs inward from the right hand margin, while the sixth has its first line indented in modern fashion. The words are very rarely divided between two lines on either I $a$ or $b$, or II $a$ or $b$.
Ia este persklum aves anzeriates enetu | pernaies pusnaes. preveres treplanes | Iuve Krapuvi tre buf fetu. arvia ustentu, | vatuva ferine feitu, heris vinu 5 heri puni, $\|$ ukriper Fisiu, tutaper Ikuvina feitu. sevum | kutef pesnimu adepes arves. |
pusveres treplanes tref sif kumiaf feitu | Trebe Iuvie ukriper Fisiu, tutaper Ikuvina. | supa sumtu, 10 arvia ustentu, puni fetu, $\|$ kutef pesnimu adep arvies. |
preveres tesenakes tre buf fetu, Marte Krapuvi fetu ukripe Fisiu, tutaper Ikuvina. arvia ustentu, vatuva ferine fetu, puni fetu, kutef pesnimu adpes arves.

Aes omits interp. after 3 tre and arvia, 4 vatuva, 7 tref, 9 supa, arvia and puni, 10 kutef. The last word in this line seems to be adeparvies with $p$ and $i$ obscured; it is generally corrected to match 1.6. 11 Aes trebuf. 12 The last letter of arvia appears to be a correction of $\mathfrak{u}$.

13 No interp. after vatuva, puni, kutef.
pusveres tesenakes tref sif feliuf fetu ॥ Fise Sasi ukriper Fisiu, tutaper Ikuvina. | puni tetu, supa sumtu, arviu ustentu. mefa, |vestisa ustetu, Fisuvi fetu, ukriper Fisiu fetu, | kapid purtitaf sakref, etraf purtitaf, etraf | sakref, tutaper Ikuvina. kutef pesnimu adepes arves. "
preveres vehiies tref buf kaleduf fetu Vufiune | Krapuvi ukriper Fisiu, tutaper Ikuvina. | vatuva ferine fetu, heri vinu heri puni, | arviu ustentu, kutef pesnimu adepes arves.
pusveres vehiies tref hapinaf fetu Tefre Iuvie ॥ 25 ukriper Fisiu, tutaper Ikuvina, puste asiane fetu, zedef fetu, | pelsana fetu, arvia ustentu, puni fetu, tasez pesnim u adiper arvis. api habina purtiius, sudum pesuntru | fetu, esmik vestisam preve fiktu, Tefri Iuvi fetu ukrilper Fisiu, tutaper Ikuvina, 30 testruku peḍi kapiḍe peḍum feit\|u. api edek purtiius, enuk sudum pesuntrum feitu stafllii uve esmik vestisa afiktu, ukriper Fisiu, tutaper Ikuvin|a feitu, nertruku pedi kapiḍe pedum feitu. puni feitu. api suduf purtitius, enuk hapinaru erus titu, zeḍef|kumultu, zedef kumates pesnimu.\|

Ib vukukum Iuviu, pune uvef furfa $\Theta$, tref vitluf turuf | Marte Hudie fetu pupluper tutas Iiuvinas, tutaper Ikuvina. | vatuva ferine fetu, puni fetu, arvia ustentu, kutef pesnimu | adepes arves. vu-

Aes 15 fisesas̀i, 17 fiiuvi. 18 Auf.K. corr. kapif. 26 No interp. after puni, nor 29 before fisiu, nor 30 before api. Aes edel. 31 Aes stafli iuvesmik, corr. Büch. (p. 74) comparing VI $b 37$; but the ending -lii seems corrupt and $-\operatorname{lari}(\mathbf{m})$ is wanted; ad fin. aes -vinp, but the $p$ is only the first half of $a$ which the graver finally decided to put in the next line. 33 Büch. would corr. purtiius. 34 Aes kumats. B. 2 No interp. after tutaper. 3 Aes kutep.

5 kukum Kureties tref vitluf turuf Hunte S̀e fi feitu pupluper tutas Iiuvinas, tutaper Iiuvina. vatuval ferine fetu, arvia ustentu, tenzitim arveitu, heris vinu heris | puni feitu, kutef persnimu, adipes arvis. inuk ukar pihaz fust. | svepu esumek esunu anter vakaze vasetum ise, avif azeriatu, 9 verufe treplanu kuvertu, restef esunu feitu. ॥

## 357 Table I $b$ line 10 to end.

Earlier regulations for an assembly of the populus of Iguvium, probably in connexion with the lustrum (cf. 366).
A blank line is left between every two paragraphs on the Table.
Ib 10 pune puplum aferum heries, avef anzeriatu etu pernaia|f pustnaiaf. pune kuvurtus, krenkatrum hatu. enumek | pir ahtimem ententu. pune pir entelus ahtimem, | enumek steplatu parfam tesvam tefe, tute Ikuvine.|vapefem avieklufe kumpifiatu. 15 vea aviekla esunume etu. I prinuvatu etutu, perkaf habetutu punisate. pune menes | akeduniamem, enumek etuḍstamu tuta Tadinate, trifu|Tadinate, Turskum, Naharkum numem, Iapuzkum numem: | 'svepis habe, purtatulu, pue meḍs est, feitu uru, pede meds est'. I pune prinuvatus staheren term20 nesku, enumek 'armamu kateramu Ikuvinu'. enumek apretu tures et pure. puni amprefu|us, persnimu. enumek 'etatu Ikuvinus'. triiuper amprehtu, | triiuper pesnimu, triiuper 'etatu Iku-
4. Aes vitlup turup huntese. 6 ferinefeituarvia.

7 inukukar. 8 vakazevasetumiseavif.
On final $s, r$, and $f$ see p. 403 sup. and Verner's Law in Italy, App. C.

Aes 10 anzvriatu, 13 steplatuparfam, 16 tutatadinate, 19 armanu.
vinus'. enumek | prinuvatus simu etutu, erahunt vea simu etutu prinuvatus.
funtlere trif apruf rufru ute peiu feitu Serfe 25 Marti. \| vatuvu ferine fetu, arviu ustentu, puni fetu, | tasez pesnimu adepe arves. |
rupinie e tre purka rufra ute peia fetu Prestate | S̀erfie S̀ Serfe Marties. peḍaia feitu, arviu ustentu, | kapi sakra aitu, vesklu vetu atru alfu, 30 puni fetu, $\|$ tasez pesnimu adeper arves.
tra sate tref vitlaf feitu Tuse S̀erfie S̀erfe Marties. | pedaia feitu, arviu ustetu, puni fetu, tasez pesnimu|adeper arves. pune purtins̀s, kadetu, pufe apruf|fakurent, puze erus teda. ape 35 erus tedust, pustru ॥ kupifiatu rupiname, erus teda. ene tra sahta kupifiaia, |erus teda. enu rupiname pustru kuvertu, antakre|kumate pesnimu. enu kapi sakra aitu, vesklu vetu. | enu satame kuvertu, antakre kumate pesnimu. enu esunu | purtitu fust. \|
pustertiu pane puplu atedafust, iveka perakre tusetu|super kumne adfertur, prinuvatu tuf tusetutu, | hutra furu sehmeniar hatutu. eaf iveka|tre akedunie fetu Tuse Iuvie. addviu ustetu, | puni 45 fetu, pedaia fetu, tasez pesnimu adepe arves. \| kvestretie usaie svesu vuvs̀i stitisteteies.

24 feituserfe. 25 ferime and feiu. 40 tuseiu. 42 No interp. after furu, eaf, nor 43 after tuse (ibid. Buich. corr. arviu), nor 44 after puni, pedaia, tasez, nor 45 anywhere save after kvestre, tie, usaie and at the end. The last word appears as stiteteies in II $a 44$. Some would read stiti steteies as two words, 'steterit steterint.'

Concluding sacrifice of the lustrum on behalf of the Fratres Atiedii. (Omitted in the later liturgy.)

II a pune karne speturie Atiiedie aviekate naraklum | vurtus, estu esunu fetu fratrusper Atiedie. eu esunu | esu naratu: 'pede karne speturie Atiiedie aviekate | aiu urtu fefure, fetu puze neip eretu'. 5 Vestis̀ Sase " sakre, Iuvepatre bum perakne speture perakne restatu. I Iuvie unu erietu sakre pelsanu fetu. arviu ustentu, I puni fetu, tasez pesnimu adepe arves. pune purtiius, | unu sudu pesutru fetu tikamne Iuvie, kapiḍe | pedu preve 10 fetu. ape purtiiusudu, erus tetu. enu kuma\|ltu, kumate pesnimu. Ahtu Iuvip uve peraknem pedaem fetu, arviu ustentu, puni fetu. Ahtu Marti abrunu | perakne fetu, arviu ustetu, fasiu prusesete adveitu, | pedae fetu, puni fetu, tra ekvine fetu. 14 asetus perakne fetu. "

Aes 2 estuesunu and ad fin. esum. 4 Aes omits interp. at puze, neip, and vestise, 5 at iuvepatre and bum; Büch. puts a comma at perakne, counting speture another deity. Aes omits interp. at 6 unu, erietu, and pelsanu, 7 adepe and pune, 8 sudu, 9 preve, 10 ltu and kumate. Then uveperak nem. 11 No interp. at pedaem, ustentu, ahtu, nor 13 at puni. Then ekvine.

## 359 Table II $a$ line 15 to end.

Optional sacrifice to an infernal deity (not connected with the lustrum).

There are no divisions between the paragraphs on the bronze, save that the last line is added along the left-hand margin. The first two may safely be separated; Bücheler would also begin new paragraphs with spinamad (33), kapide (34), and asama (39).

II a 15 huntia katle tisel stakaz est sume ustite|antermenzaru sersiaru. heriiei fasiu adfertur, avis anzeriates menzne kurslasiu fasia tisit.
huntia fertu | katlu arvia struhs̀la fikla pune vinu salu maletu|mantrahklu veskla snata asnata, 20 umen fertu. pir ase $\|$ antentu. esunu puni feitu.

Hunte Iuvie ampentu katlu|sakre sevakne Petruniaper natine fratru Atiediu. esunu $\mid$ peḍae futu. katles supa hahtu, sufafiaf supaf hahtu. berus aplenies prusesia kartu, krematra aplenia sutentu. pedu seritu. arvia puni purtuvitu ves25 tikatu ahtrepuda $\| t u$, pustin ansif vinu. nuvis ahtrepudatu, 'tiu puni tiu vinu'|teitu, berva frehtef fertu. pude nuvime ferest, krematruf sumel fertu. vestisia pedume persnihmu. katles tuva tefra, | terti erus prusekatu. isunt krematru prusektu. struhsla | fikla aḍeitu. katlu 30 purtuvitu, ampedia persnihmu, aseseta \| karne persnihmu, venpersuntra persnihmu. supa span-

18 On the $M$ of salu and of seritu in 1.24 see p. 402 sup. 28 Should we correct prusektu to prusekatu as immediately before and in III 33,35, IV 2 ? I find it hard to regard it with Bücheler as a parallel form (like lavito: luvato), which would have surely become -seitu. 30 Aes has no interp. at karne, and then eenpersuntra.
tea | pertentu. veskles vufetes persnihmu vestikatu ahtrepudatu|aḍpeltu statitatu. supapustra perstu. iepru erus manikuveitu. | spinamadetu. tuvere kapidus pune fertu. berva, klavlaf a|anfehtaf, vesklu snatu asnatu, umen fertu. kapide 35 Hunte $\|$ Iuvie vestikatu Petruniaper natine fratru Atiiediu. berus | sevaknis persnihmu pert spinia. isunt klavles persnihmu. | veskles snate asnates sevaknis spiniama persnihmu vestikatu | ahtrepudatu. spina umtu, umne sevakni persnihmu. manf easa|vutu. asama kuvertu. asaku vinu 40 sevakni tasez persnihmu. " esuf pusme herter, erus kuveitu tedtu. vinu pune tedtu. | struhs̀las fiklas sufafias kumaltu. kapide punes vepuratu. antakres kumates persnihmu. amparihmu, statita subahtu. esunu|purtitu futu. katel asaku pelsans futu.
44 kvestretie usas̀e svesu vuvs̀i stiteteies.

31 No interp. at vufetes. 33 tuve rekapidus.
34 No interp. at snatu. Auf.-K. put the full stop after kapide, but in these short commands the impv. nearly always comes last, and umen ('fat') is not elsewhere put in kapide. 35 Aes petruniapert. 42 Aes persmhniu. 44 In this marginal line there are no interpp.

Half-yearly assembly of 'decuriae' from ten towns or clans.

> There are no divisions between the paragraphs on the bronze (indeed there is not even an interp. at the end of the first), but the sense clearly justifies their separation. Auf.-K. divide even more frequently.

II b semenies tekuries sim kaprum upetu. tekvias famedias pumpedias XII. Atiiediate, etre Atiiediate, | Klaverniie, etre Klaverniie, Kureiate, etre Kureiate, | Satanes, etre Satane, Peiediate, 5 etre Peiediate, Talenate, ॥ etre Talenate, Museiate, etre Museiate, Iuieskane, |etre Iuieskanes, Kaselate, etre Kaselate, tertie Kaselate, | Peraznanie teitu.
admune Iuve patre fetu. si peralkne sevakne upetu eveietu. sevakne naratu. arviu|ustetu, eu 10 naratu puze fasefele sevakne. heri puni \| heri vinu fetu. vaputu Sasi ampetu. kapru perakne sevalkne upetu eveietu naratu. sive ampetu, fesnere purtuletu. ife fertu, tafle e pir fertu, kapres prusesetu | ife adveitu. persutru vaputis mefa vistisa feta fertu.| sviseve fertu pune, etre 15 sviseve vinu fertu, tertie $\|$ sviseve utur fertu. pistu niru fertu, vepesutra fertu, 1 mantraklu fertu, pune fertu. pune fesnafe benus, | kabru

1 Aes semenies. 2 The numeral is of course written IIX. 3 Aes etrekureiate. 4 etresatane and etrep eiediate. $\quad 5$ and 6 No interp. after any one etre nor tertie. 7 pera is followed by an interp. 8 Aes upetue veietu. 9 eunaratu, then fasefete. 10 herivinufetu eaputu, then perakne. 11 Interp. after purtu. 12 epirfer tu. 13 ifeadveitu and fetafertu. 14 svi se ve vinufertu. 15 uturfertu pistunirufertu. 17 kabru-
purtuvetu. vaputu Sasi Iuvepatre prepesnimu. vepesutra pesnimu, veskles pesnimu atrepudatu adpeltu statitatu. vesklu pustru pestu, ranu $\|$ 20 pesnimu, puni pesnimu, vinu pesnimu, une pesnimu. enu erus tetu.

Vitlu vufru pune heries |fas̀u, eruhu tislu sestu Iuvepatre. pune seste, $\mid$ urfeta manuve habetu. estu iuku habetu: |'Iupater Sase, tefe estu vitlu 25 vufru sestu'. ॥ purtifele triiuper teitu, triiuper vufru naratu, | fetu Iuvepatre Vusiiaper natine fratru Atiiediu. | pune anpenes, krikatru testre e uze habetu. ape apel/us, mefe atentu. ape pur29 tuvies, testre e uze habetu | krikatru. arviu ustetu, punifetu.

## 361 Tables III and IV.

Directions for sacrifice to Jupiter, Pomonus, Vesuna and others in a particular month.

No word is divided between any two lines on these two Tables. On Table III for no apparent reason lines $4,5,6,29$ and 30 begin about 7 letters' space inwards from the margin. For the peculiarities in the writing see p. 401.

III esunu fuia herter sume | ustite sestentasiaru| urnasiaru. huntak vuke prumu pehatu. | inuk uhturu 5 urtes puntis\|frater ustentuta, pude| fratru mersus fust | kumnakle. inukuhtur vapede | kumnakle sistu.
purtu vetu. 18 vesklespesnimu atre pudatu. 19 The first letter of ranu is 9 , which is more probably $r$ than $d$. 20 pesni mu and unepesni. 21 enuerustetu and puneheries. 22 puneseste. 24 estuvitlu. 25 tri iuperteitu. 26 feiu and fratruatiiediu. 27 euze and apeapel. 28 apepurtuvies and euzehabetu. 29 punifetu.
sakre, uvem uhtur | teitu, puntes terkantur. inumek 10 sakre, || uvem urtas puntes fratrum upetuta. | inumek via mersuva arvamen etuta. | erak pir persklu udetu. sakre, uvem | kletra fertuta aituta, arven kletram 15 amparitu. eruk esunufutu. kletre tuplak $\|$ prumum antentu, inuk sihseda ententu, | inuk kazi ferime antentu. isunt fedehtru|antentu, isunt sufedaklu antentu. seples | ahesnes tris kazi astintu, fedehtru etres tris | ahesnes astintu, sufedaklu tuves ahesnes \| 20 anstintu. inenek vukumen esunumen etu. ap | vuku kukehes, iepi persklumad kaditu. vuke pir | ase antentu. sakre sevakne upetu. Iuvepatre | prumu ampentu testru sese asa fratrusper | Atiiedies, ahtis25 per eikvasatis, tutape Iiuvina, " trefiper Iiuvina. tis̀lu sevakni teitu. | inumek uvem sevakni upetu. Puemune | Pupdike apentu. tis̀lu sevakni naratu. | iuka mersuva uvikum habetu fratruspe | Atiiedie, 30 ahtisper eikvasatis, tutaper \| Iiuvina, trefiper Iiuvina. sakre| vatra ferine feitu, eruku aruvia feitu. uvem | pedaem pelsanu feitu. ererek tuva tefra spantimad prusekatu, edek pedume purtuvitu, | strusla adveitu. inumek etrama spanti tuva tefra 35 prusekatu, eḍek eres̀luma Puemune Pupdike IV purtuvitu, erarunt struhslas eskamitu aveitu. | inumek tertiama spanti triia tefra prusekatu, | edek supru sese eres̀luma Vesune Puemunes | Pupdises pur5 tuvitu, struhsla petenata isek \|adveitu. erererunt kapidus Puemune, | Vesune purtuvitu. asamad ereslumad | asesetes karnus, iseseles et vempesuntres | supes sanes pertentu persnimu adpeltu|statitatu. 10 veskles snates asnates sevakne $\|$ eresluma persnimu Puemune Pupdike, Vesune | Puemunes Pupdikes.

III 23 Aes seseasa. tefra. 6 eres̀lamad.

32 tuvatefra.
IV 2 triia-
7 single medial interp. after et.
klavles persnihmu|Puemune Pupdike* et Vesune Puemunes | Pupdikes pustin eres̀lu. inuk eres̀lu umtu|putrespe erus. inuk vestisia mefa Purtupite $\|$ 15 skaliseta kunikaz apehtre esuf testru sese | asa asama purtuvitu, sevakne sukatu.|inumek vestesa persuntru supu eres̀le Hule | sevakne skalseta kunikaz purtuvitu. inumek | vestisia persuntru Turse 20 super eres̀le sevakne \|skals̀etakunikaz purtuviou. inumek tehtedim | etu veltu, eḍek persuntre antentu. inumek | ars̀lataf vasus ufestne sevaknef purtuvitu. | inumk pruzude kebu sevakne persnihmu 25 Puemune Pupdise. inumek kletra veskles \|vufetes sevaknis persnihmu Vesune | Puemunes Pupḍes. inumek svepis heri, |ezariaf antentu. inumek erus tasez | tertu. inumek kumaltu, adkani | kanetu, 30 kumates persnihmu. esuku\|esunu udetu. tapistenu habetu, pune | frehtu habetu. ap itek fakust, purtitu | futu. huntak pidi prupehast, eḍek | ures punes neiḍabas.

## 362 Table Vi.

Administrative resolution of the Fratres Atiedii.
This paragraph is marked off from the rest by a short horizontal line above the first five letters of 1.14. In this part no words are divided between two lines. On the peculiarities of $\alpha \beta$ in Tab. V see p. 401.

Va esuk frater Atiiediur | eitipes plenasier urnasier uhtretie / T T Kastrusiie. adfertur pisi pumpe | fust eikvasese Atiiedier, ere ri esune ॥! 5 kuraia, prehabia, piḍe uraku ri esuna | si herte, et pure esune sis. sakreu | perakneu upetu, re-

12 Puemune Pupdikes, 17 vesvesa, and 18 inuntek.
20 Buch. purtuvitu, 25 Aes persihmu.
V a 3 The interp. is single and medial after the second T .
vestu, pude tedte, | eru emantur herte, et pihaklu 10 pune | tribdisu fuiest, akrutu revestu || emantu herte. adfertur pisi pumpe \| fust, erek esunesku vepurus felsva | adputrati fratru Atiiediu pre13 hubia | et nudpener prever pusti kastruvuf. |

On final $s, r$, and $f$ in the Third and Fourth Period v. 403 f. and Verner's Law in Italy, App. C.

## 363 Table Vii.

Another resolution of the Fratres.
Va 14 frater Atiiediur esu eitipes plenasier \| urnasier uhtretie K T Kluviier, kumnah|kle Atiiedie, ukre eikvasese Atiiedier, | ape apelust, muneklu habia numer | prever pusti kastruvuf, et ape purtitu 20 fust, muneklu habia numer tupler \| pusti kastruvu, et ape subra spafu fust, | muneklu habia numer tripler pusti|kastruvu. et ape frater sersnatur furent ehvelklu feia fratreks ute kvestur, 25 sve rehte kuratu si. sve mestru karu $\|$ fratru Atiiediu, pure ulu benurent, | prusikurent rehte kuratu eru, edek | prufe si. sve mestru karu fratru Atiieḍ|iu, pure ulu benurent, prusikurent 29 kuratu rehte neip eru, enuk fratru
behvelklu feia fratreks|utekvestur, panta muta adferture si. panta muta fratru|Atiediu mestru 5 karu, pure ulu \| benurent, adferture eru pepur-


[^98]
## 364 Table V iii.

Food for the Fratres.
On the Latin $\alpha \beta$ of this and the following inscc. see pp. 401 and 406.
8 Clauerniur dirsas herti fratrus Atiersir posti acnu | farer 10 opeter p IIII agre Tlatie Piquier Martier et sesna || homonus duir, puri far eiscurent, ote a VI. Clauerni | dirsans herti frateer Atiersiur sehmenier dequrier | pelmner sorser 13 posti acnu uef $\mathbf{X}$ cabriner uef V, pretra | toco postra fahe, et sesna ote a VI. Casilos dirsa herti fratrus | Atiersir posti 15 acnu farer opeter p VI agre Casiler Piquier $\|$ Martier et sesna homonus duir, puri far eiscurent, ote a VI. Casilate dirsans herti frateer Atiersiur sehmenier dequrier pelmner sorser posti acnu uef XV cabriner uef VIIS et $\mid$ 18 s̀esna ote a VI.

$$
365 \text { Table VI } a-b 47 .
$$

## Later regullations for the lustration of Iguvium (of. 356).

[^99]VI a este persclo aueis aseriater enetu, parfa curnase dersua, peiqu peica merstu. poei angla aseriato eest, eso tremnu

11 Between frat and er there is a blotch in the bronze, easily filled from line 16. 12 The second $\mathbf{r}$ in pretra was at first omitted and then added above the line; so the first $r$ in Martier l. 15.

VI $a 2$ Aes eesteso. In the punctuation of 11.2 and 3 I follow Thurneysen Ind. Anzeiger IV. p. 39; he takes stiplo and aserio as impvv., Buich. regarded both as inff. and connected them
serse arsferture ehueltu: 'stiplo aseriaia parfa dersua, curnaco 3 dersua, | peico mersto, peica mersta, mersta auuei, mersta angla esona'. arfertur eso anstiplatu: | 'ef aserio parfa dersua, curnaco dersua, peico mersto, peica mersta, mersta 5 aueif, merstaf \| anglaf esona mehe, tote lioueine, esmei stahmei stahmeitei'. sersi pirsi sesust, poi angla | aseriato est, erse neip mugatu nep arsir andersistu, nersa courtust, porsi angla anseriato | iust. sue muieto fust ote pisi arsir andersesust, disleralinsust. |
8 uerfale pufe arsfertur trebeit ocrer peihaner, erse stahmito eso tuderato est: angluto | hondomu, porsei nesimei asa deueia est, anglome somo, porsei nesimei uapersus auiehcleir ॥ 10 est, eine angluto somo uapefe auiehclu todcome tuder, angluto hondomu asame deueia todcome | tuder. eine todceir tuderus seipodruhpei seritu.
tuderor totcor: uapersusto auieclir ebetrafe, ooserclome, 13 presoliafe nurpier, uasirslome, | smursime, tettome miletinar, tertiame praco pracatarum; uapersusto auieclir carsome Vestisier, randeme rufrer, tettome noniar, tettome salier, 15 carsome Hoier, pertome padellar. " hondra esto tudero, porsei subra screihtor sent, parfa dersua, curnaco dersua seritu. subra esto | tudero peico mersto, peica mersta seritu. sue anclar procanurent, eso tremnu serse | combifiatu, arsferturo nomne carsitu: 'parfa dersua, curnaco dersua, peico mersto, 18 peica meersta, | mersta aueif, mersta ancla eesona tefe, tote Iiouine, esmei stahmei stahmitei'. esisco esoneir seueir | popler anferener et ocrer pihaner perca arsmatia habitu. 20 uasor uerisco treblanir, porsi ocrer \|| pehaner paca ostensendi, eo iso ostendu, pusi pir pureto cehefi dia. surur uerisco tesonocir. surur | uerisco uehieir. |
pre uereir treblaneir Iuve Grabouei buf treif fetu. eso 23 naratu uesteis: 'teio subocau suboco | dei Graboui, ocriper
with what went before. 5 Aes iioueineesmei. 7 andersesusp. 8 stahmitoesotuderatoest. 10 eineanglutosomo uapefeauiehclu todcometuder. 11 tudereine. 12 uapersustoauieclir. On the use of capital letters in this text in ll. $12-14$ see p. 408.

Fisiu, totaper Iiouina, erer nomneper, erar nomneper ; fos sei, pacer sei ocre Fisei, | tote Iiouine, erer nomne, erar nomne. arsie tio subocau suboco dei Graboue. arsier frite tio sub25 ocau ॥ suboco dei Graboue. di Grabouie, tio esu bue peracrei pihaclu ocreper Fisiu, totaper Iouina, irer nomneper, | erar nomneper. dei Grabouie, orer ose persei ocre Fisie pir orto est, toteme Iouine arsmor dersecor $\mid$ subator sent, pusei neip heritu. dei Crabouie, persei tuer perscler uaseto est, pese28 tomest, peretomest, | frosetom est, daetomest, tuer perscler uirseto auirseto uas est, di Grabouie, persei mersei, esu bue | peracrei pihaclu pihafei. di Grabouie, pihatu ocre Fisei, 30 pihatu tota Iouina. di Grabouie, pihatu ocrer \| Fisier, totar Iouinar nome, nerf, arsmo, ueiro, pequo, castruo, fri; pihatu, futu fos, pacer pase tua ocre Fisi, | tote Iiouine, erir nomne, erar nomne. di Grabouie, saluo seritu ocre Fisi, salua seritu tota Iiouina. di $\mid$ Grabouie, saluo seritu ocrer Fisier, totar Iiouinar nome, nerf, arsmo, ueiro, pequo, castruo, fri; salua | 33 seritu, futu fos, pacer pase tua ocre Fisi, tote Iouine, erer nomne, erar nomne. di Grabouie, tio esu bue $~ / ~ p e r a c r i$ pihaclu ocreper Fisiu, totaper Iouina, erer nomneper, erar nomneper. di Grabouie, tio subocau. II
35 di Grabouie, tio esu bue peracri pihaclu etru ocreper Fisiu, totaper Iouina, erer nomneper, erar nomneper. di Grabouie, orer ose persei ocre Fisie pir ortoest, tote Iouine arsmor dersecor subator sent, pusei neip | hereitu. di Crabouie, persi tuer perscler uas̀etom est, pesetomest, peretomest, 38 frosetomest, daetomest, tuer | perscler uirseto auirseto uas est, di Grabouie, persi mersi, esu bue peracri pihaclu etru pihafi. di Grabouie, | pihatu ocre Fisi, pihatu tota Iouina. di Grabouie, pihatu ocrer Fisier, totar Iiouinar nome, nerf, 40 arsmo, ueiro, $\|$ pequo, castruo, fri ; pihatu, futu fos, pacer

30 Aes ueiropequo and ocrefisi. 31 Auf.-K. and Büch. corr. erer nomne; the $\mathbf{i}$ of the bronze has a slight bar at the bottom as though the graver thought of making $e$ and stopped midway. 32 Aes pequocastruo. 35 pihaclu was first engraved pihaclo. 40 Aes pequoc astruo.
pase tua ocre Fisie, tote Iiouine, erer nomne, erar nomne. di | Grabouie, saluo seritu ocre Fisim, salua seritu totam Iiouina. di Grabouie, saluuom seritu ocrer Fisier, totar Iiouinar nome, nerf, arsmo, uiro, pequo, castruo, frif; saluua 43 seritu, futu fons, pacer pase tuua ocre Fisi, tote I Iouine, erer nomne, erar nomne. di Grabouie, tiom essu bue peracri pihaclu etru ocriper Fissiu, totaper Iouina, erer | nomneper, erar nomneper. di Grabouie, tiom subocau.
45 di Grabouie, tiom esu bue peracri pihaclu tertiu ocriper Fisiu, totaper Iiouina, erer nomneper, erar nomneper. di Grabouie, orer ose pirse ocrem Fisiem pir ortom est, toteme Iouinem arsmor dersecor subator sent, pusi neip | heritu. di Grabouie, perse tuer pescler uasetom est, pesetom est, peretom 48 est, frosetom est, daetom est, tuer $\mid$ pescler uirseto auirseto uasest, di Grabouie, pirsi mersi, esu bue peracri pihaclu tertiu pihafi. di Grabouie, | pihatu ocrem Fisim, pihatu totam Iouinam. di Grabouie, pihatu ocrer Fisier, totar 50 Iiouinar nome, nerf, asmo, || uiro, pequo, castruo, fri ; pihatu, futu fons, pacer pase tua ocre Fisi, tote Iiouine, erer nomne, erar nomne. di | Grabouie, saluo seritu ocrem Fisim, saluam seritu totam Iiouinam. di Grabouie, saluom seritu ocrer Fisier, | totar Iiouinar nome, nerf, arsmo, uiro, pequo, castruo,
53 frif; salua seritu, futu fons, pacer pase tua ocre Fisi, | tote Iiouine, erer nomne, erar nomne. di Grabouie, tiom esu bue peracri pihaclu tertiu ocriper Fisiu, totaper | Iiouina, erer nomneper, erar nomneper. di Grabouie, tio comohota tribri-
55 sine buo peracnio pihaclo \| ocriper Fisiu, totaper Iiouina, erer nomneper, erar nomneper. di Grabouie, tiom subocau,' tases persnimu | seuom. surur purdouitu, proseseto naratu, prosesetir mefa spefa, ficla arsueitu, aruio fetu. este / esono heri uinu heri poni fetu, uatuo ferine fetu.
post uerir treblanir si gomia trif fetu Trebo Iouie ocriper

41 ocrefisim and totamiouina. 42 castruofrif. 43 er er nomneerar. 45 pihaclutertiu. 46 grabouieorer and fisiempir. 47 digrabouie. 48 peracrip ihaclu tertiupihafi. 50 fisitote. 58 Auf.-K. corr. Trebe to match

59 Fisiu, totaper Iiouina. persae fetu, aruio fetu, | pone fetu, tases persnimu. surur naratu, puse pre uerir treblanir. prosesetir strusla, ficla arsueitu. |

VI b pre uerir tesenocir buf trif fetu Marte Grabouei ocriper Fisiu, totaper Iiouina. aruio fetu, uatuo ferine fetu, poni fetu, tases persnimu. prosesetir farsio, ficla arsueitu. surur naratu, puse pre uerir treblanir. |
3 post uerir tesenocir sif filiu trif fetu Fiso Sansie ocriper Fisiu, totaper Iiouina, poni feitu, persae fetu, aruio fetu. surur naratu, pusi pre uerir treblanir. tases persnimu. 5 mandraclo difue destre habitu. prosesetir ficla, " strus̀la arsueitu. ape sopo postro peperscust, uestisia et mefa spefa scalsie conegos fetu Fisoui Sansi | ocriper Fisiu, totaper Iouina. eso persnimu uestisia uestis: 'tio subocau suboco Fisoui Sansi, ocriper Fisiu, | totaper Iiouina, erer nomneper, erar nomneper, fons sir, pacer sir ocre Fisi, tote Iiouine, erer 8 nomne, / erar nomne. arsie tiom subocau suboco Fisoui Sansi. asier frite tiom subocau suboco Fisoui Sansi'. suront | poni pesnimu. mefa spefa eso persnimu: 'Fisouie Sansie, tiom esa mefa spefa Fisouina ocriper Fisiu, totaper 10 Iiouina, erer nomneper, erar nomneper. Fisouie Sans̀ie, ditu ocre Fisi, tote Iouine, ocrer Fisie, totar Iouinar dupursus | peturpursus fato fito, perne postne, sepse sarsite, uouse auie esone; futu fons, pacer pase tua ocre Fisi, tote Iiouine, | erer nomne, erar nomne. Fisouie Sans̀ie, saluo seritu ocrem Fisi, totam Iouinam. Fisouie Sansie, saluo

I $a 8$, but Büch. reasonably takes Trebo as dat. of an $-\mathbf{u}$ - stem, comparing the variation Sanco-, Sancu- (309 A sup.).

VI $b 1$ fetumartegrabouei and fetuponi. 3 One letter seems to have been expunged between fi and liu. Then fetufiso. 4 One letter seems to have been expunged between destr and e. $\quad 5$ Aes u estisiaet and then confgos. 6 subocofisouisansi. 7 sirocre. 8 subocofisoui. 9 mefaspefa. 10 nomneperfisouie.

11 sepsesarsite uou se.
12 fisouiesansie once and saluoseritu twice.

13 seritu | ocrer Fisier, totar Iouinar nome, nerf, arsmo, uiro, pequo, castruo, frif; salua seritu, futu fons, pacer pase | tua ocre Fisi, tote Iiouine, erer nomne, erar nomne. Fisouie
15 Sansie, tiom esa mefa spefa Fisouina ocriper Fisiu, || totaper Iiouina, erer nomneper, erar nomneper. Fisouie Sansie, tiom subocau; Fisouie frite tiom subocau'. pesclu | semu uesticatu, atripursatu. ape eam purdinsust, proseseto erus ditu. eno scalseto uestisiar erus conegos | dirstu. eno mefa, uestisia sopa purome efurfatu, subra spahmu. eno serse 18 comoltu, comatir persnihimu. | capif purdita dupla aitu, sacra dupla aitu. |
pre uerir uehier buf trif calersu fetu Vofione Grabouie ocriper Fisiu, totaper Iiouina. uatuo ferine fetu. herie
20 uinu, \| herie poni fetu, aruio fetu, tases persnimu. proseseter mefa spefa, ficla arsueitu. suront naratu, pusi preuerir | treblanir. |
post uerir uehier habina trif fetu Tefrei Ioui ocriper Fisiu, totaper Iiouina. serse fetu, pelsana fetu, aruio feitu, 23 poni | fetu, tasis pesnimu. prosesetir strus̀la, ficla arueitu. suront naratu, puse uerisco treblanir. ape habina purdins̀us, | eront poi habina purdinsust, destruco persi uestisia et pesondro sorsom fetu. capirse perso osatu, eam mani
25 nertru tenitu, arnipo uestisia uesticos. capirso subotu, isec perstico erus ditu, esoc persnimu uestis: 'tiom | subocau suboco Tefro Ioui, ocriper Fisiu, totaper Iiouina, erer nomneper, erar nomneper, fonsir, pacer si ocre Fisi, tote | Iouine, erer nomne, erar nomne. arsie tiom subocau suboco Tefro Ioui. arsier frite tiom subocau suboco Tefro Ioui. Tefre
28 Iouie, tiom esu sorsu persontru Tefrali pihaclu ocriper Fisiu, totaper Iiouina, erer nomneper, erar nomneper. Tefre

13 fisi er. 15 erernomneper, the per being added above the line; then erite. 17 uestisiasopa. 19 Aes buftrif calersufetuuofione and uatuoferine. 23 The diacritic in \$ of purdinsus is faint. 26 Aes iouiocriper. 27 tefroiouiarsier and subocausuboco. 28 sorsupersontru.

Iouie, orer ose perse ocre Fisie pir orto est, tote Iiouine arsmor dersecor subator sent, pusi neip heritu. Tefre Iouie, ॥ 30 perse touer pescler uasetomest, pesetomest, peretomest, frosetomest, daetomest, touer pescler uirseto auirseto uas est, | Tefre Iouie, perse mers est, esu sorsu persondru pihaclu pihafi. Tefre Iouie, pihatu ocre Fisi, tota Iiouina. Tefre Iouie, pihatu | ocrer Fisier, totar Iiouinar nome, nerf, arsmo, uiro, pequo, castruo, fri; pihatu, futu fons, pacer pase tua 33 ocre Fisi, tote I Iiouine, erer nomne, erar nomne. Tefre Iouie, saluo seritu ocre Fisi, totam Iiouinam. Tefre Iouie, saluom seritu ocrer Fisier, | totar Iouinar nome, nerf, arsmo, uiro, pequo, castruo, fri; salua seritu, futu fons, pacer pase 35 tua ocre Fisi, tote Iiouine, erer $\|$ nomne, erar nomne. Tefre *Iouie, tiom esu sorsu persondru Tefrali pihaclu ocriper Fisiu, totaper Iiouina, erer nomneper, erar | nomneper. Tefre Iouie, tiom subocau'. persclu sehemu atropu[r]satu. |
pesondro staflare nertruco persi fetu. suront capirse perso osatu, suror persnimu, puse sorsu. ape pesondro pur38 dins̀us, | proseseto erus dirstu. enom uestisiar sorsalir destruco persi persome erus dirstu, pue sorso purdinsus. enom | uestisiam staflarem nertruco persi sururont erus dirstu. enom pesondro sorsalem persome, pue persnis fust, 40 ife $\|$ endendu, pelsatu. enom pesondro staflare persome, pue pesnis fus, ife endendu, pelsatu. enom uaso porse pesondrisco habus, I serse subra spahatu. anderuomu sersitu, arnipo comatir pesnis fust. serse pisher comoltu, serse comatir persnimu. | purdito fust. |

29 iouieorer with the interp. added above the 0 ; then perseocre. 30 Aes uasetomesf, and the last t of frosetomest is added above the line. 31 estesu. 32 pfquo and then pihatufutu. 33 serituocre. 34 pequocastruo and pacerpase. 35 tefre iouie. 36 atropusatu. 37 staflar e. 38 dirstuenom uestisiarsorsalir. 39 sururonterusdirstu and fustife. 40 endendupelsatu. 41 spahatuanderuomu, fustserse and comoltuserse.

43 uocucom Iouiu, ponne oui furfant, uitlu toru trif fetu. Marte Horse fetu popluper totar Iiouinar, totaper Iiouina. uatuo ferine $\mid$ fetu, poni fetu, aruio fetu, tases persnimu. prosesetir fasio, ficla arsueitu. suront naratu, puse uerisco treblanir.
45 uocucom Coredier uitlu toru trif fetu. Honde Serfi fetu popluper totar Iiouinar, totaper Iiouina* uatuo ferine fetu, aruio | fetu, heri uinu, heri poni fetu, tases persnimu. prosesetir tesedi, ficla arsueitu. suront naratu, puse uerisco treblanir.
eno ocar | pihos fust. suepo esome esono ander uacose uasetome fust, auif aseriatu, uerofe treblano couertu, reste esono feitu.

Later regulations for the assembly of the populus (cf. 357).

> A new paragraph begins at 1.61 of the original, but as it is in the middle of a prayer at a point where none of the other prayers are broken, I have followed Bücheler in disregarding the division. Perhaps the pause was meant to enhance the curse which precedes.

VI b 48 Pone poplo afero heries, auif aseriato etu. sururo stiplatu, pusi ocrer pihaner. sururont combifiatu. eriront tuderus auif | seritu. ape angla combifiansiiust, perca arsmatiam anouihimu. cringatro hatu, destrame scapla 50 anouihimu. pir endendu. pone $\|$ esonome ferar, pufe pir entelust, ere fertu poe perca arsmatiam habiest. erihont aso destre onse fertu. erucom prinuatur dur I etuto, perca ponisiater habituto. ennom stiplatu parfa desua seso, tote

43 horsefetu. 45 Iiouinar uatue and fetuaruio. 46 fetuheri, ficlmrsueitu and enoocar. 47 aseriatuuerofe.

49 Aes cringatrohatu destra me scapla. 50 esonomf efrar then poeperca and prinuaturdur. 51 ponisia ter.

Iiouine. sururont combifiatu uapefe auieclu neip |amboltu, prepa desua combifiansi. ape desua combifiansiust, uia auiecla esonome etuto com peracris sacris. ape ace[r]soniame |
53 hebetafe benust, enom termnuco stahituto. poi percam arsmatia habiest, eturstahmu. eso eturstahmu: 'pisest totar | Tarsinater, trifor Tarsinater, Tuscer Naharcer Iabuscer nomner, eetu ehesu poplu, nosue ier ehe esu poplu, 55 sopir habe $\|$ esme pople, portatu ulo pue mersest, fetu uru pirse mers est'. trioper eheturstahamu. ifont termnuco com prinuatir | stahitu, eno deitu: 'arsmahamo caterahamo Iouinur'. eno com prinuatir peracris sacris ambretuto. ape ambrefurent, | termnome benurent, termnuco com prinuatir eso persnimumo tasetur: 'Serfe Martie, Prestota S̀erfia 58 S̀erfer | Martier, Tursa S̀erfia S̀erfer Martier, totam Tarsinatem, trifo Tarsinatem, Tuscom Naharcom Iabuscom nome, | totar Tarsinater, trifor Tarsinater, Tuscer Naharcer
60 Iabuscer nomner nerf sihitu ansihitu, iouie hostatu \| anhostatu tursitu tremitu, hondu holtu, ninctu nepitu, sonitu sauitu, preplotatu preuilatu. | Serfe Martie, Prestota Serfia Serfer Martier, Tursa S̀erfia Serfer Martier, fututo foner pacrer pase uestra pople totar Iiouinar, I tote Iiouine, ero nerus sihitir ans̀ihitir, iouies hostatir anostatir, ero nomne, erar nomne'. ape este dersicurent, eno deitu 'etato Tiouinur', porse perca arsmatia habiest. ape este dersicust, duti ambretuto euront. ape termnome | couortuso, sururont pesnimumo. sururont deitu, etaians deitu. enom tertim 65 ambretuto. ape termnome benuso, \| sururont pesnimumo, sururont deitu etaias. eno prinuatur simo etuto erafont uia, pora benuso.

52 esonomeetuto and acesoniame. 53 hebetafe, but contrast VI $a 12$ sup. 54 poplusopir. 55 Aes fsme and pirsemersest. 56 enocom. 59 totar tarsinat er. 61 Serfia is added above the line, then popletotar. 62 iiouineero. 63 arsmatiahabiestapeeste.

The first two lines of VIIa are occupied with an exact. repetition of the last line of VI b.

VII a 3 fondlire abrof trif fetu heriei rofu, heriei peiu. S̀erfe Martie feitu popluper totar Iiouinar, totaper | Iiouina. uatuo ferine feitu. poni fetu. aruio fetu. tases persnimu. 5 prosesetir mefa spefa, ficla arsueitu. \| suront naratu, puse uerisco treblanir. ape traha sahata combifiansust, enom erus dirstu. |
rubine porca trif rofa ote peia fetu Prestote Serfie S̀erfer Martier popluper totar Iiouinar, totaper | Iouina. persaia fetu. poni fetu. aruio fetu. suront naratu, pusi pre uerir 8 treblanir. tases persnimu. prosesetir strus̀la, ficla arsueitu. ape supo postro pepescus, enom pesclu ruseme uesticatu Prestote Serfie | Serfer Martier popluper totar Iouinar, totaper Iouina. enom uesclir adrir ruseme eso persnihimu: 10 'Prestota || Serfia S̀erfer Martier, tiom esir uesclir adrir popluper totar Iiouinar, totaper Iiouina, erer nomneper, | erar nomneper. Prestota Serfia Serfer Martier, preuendu uia ecla atero tote Tarsinate, trifo Tarsinate, | Tursce Naharce Iabusce nomne, totar Tarsinater, trifor Tarsinater, 13 Tuscer Naharcer Iabuscer nomner | nerus sitir ansihitir, iouies hostatir anostatir, ero nomne. Prestota S̀erfia S̀erfer Martier, futu fons | pacer pase tua pople totar Iiouinar, tote Iiouine, erom nomne, erar nomne, erar nerus sihitir ansihitir, 15 iouies \| hostatir anostatir. Prestota Serfia Serfer Martier, saluom seritu poplom totar Iiouinar, salua serituu | totam Liouinam. Prestota Serfia Serfer Martier, saluo seritu popler totar Iiouinar, totar Iiouinar | nome nerf arsmo uiro pequo castruo frif, salua seritu, futu fons pacer pase tua 18 pople totar Iiouinar, | tote Iiouine, erer nomne, erar nomne. Prestota Serfia S̀erfer Martier, tiom esir uesclir adrer

VII a 3 Aes seree. 4 prosesetirmefa. 14 The second nomne erar is added above the line. 17 Aes pase t ua.
popluper | totar Iiouinar, totaper Iouina, erer nomneper, erar nomneper. Prestota S̀erfia Serfer Martier, tiom |l subocauu. Prestotar Serfiar Serfer Martier foner fite tion subocauu'. ennom persclu eso deitu: | 'Prestota S̀erfia Serfer Martier, tiom isir uesclir adrir, tiom plener popluper totar Iiouinar, totaper | Iiouina, erer nomneper, erar nomneper. Prestota Serfia* S̀erfer Martier, tiom subocauu. 23 Prestotar S̀̀rfiar Serfer Martier foner frite tiom subocauu'. enom uesticatu, ahatripursatu. enom ruseme | persclu uesticatu Prestote S̀ Serfie S̀erfer Martier popluper totar Iiouinar, 25 totaper Iouina. ennom uesclir \| alfir persnimu, superne adro trahuorfi andendu, eso persnimu: 'Prestota S̀ Serfia Serfer Martier, tiom | esir uesclir alfir popluper totar Iiouinar, totaper Iiouina, erer nomneper, erar nomneper. Prestota | S̀erfia S̀erfer Martier, ahauendu uia ecla atero 28 pople totar Iiouinar, tote Iiouine, popler totar Iouinar, | totar Iiouinar nerus s̀ihitir ans̀ihitir, iouies hostatir anhostatir, ero nomne, erar nomne. Prestota Serfia I Serfer Martier, saluom seritu poplo totar Iiouinar, salua seritu totam 30 Iiouinam. Prestota S̀erfia S̀erfer ${ }^{\text {M Martier, saluom seritu }}$ popler totar Iiouinar, totar Iiouinar nome nerf arsmo uiro pequo castruo frif, | salua seritu, futu fons pacer pase tua pople totar Iiouinar, tote Iiouine, erer nomne, erar nomne. Prestota | S̀erfia S̀erfer Martier, tiom esir uesclir alfer popluper totar Liouinar, totaper Iiouina, erer nomneper, 33 erar | nomneper. Prestota S̀erfia Serfer Martier, tiom subocauu. Prestotar S̀erfiar S̀erfer Martier foner frite tiom | subocauu'. ennom persclu eso persnimu: 'Prestota S̀erfia Serfer Martier, tiom isir uesclir alfer, tiom plener ॥ 35 popluper totar Iiouinar, totaper Iiouina, erer nomneper, erar nomneper. Prestota Serfia Serfer Martier, tiom | subocauu. Prestotar S̀erfiar S̀erfer Martier foner frite tiom subocauu'. enom uesticatu, ahatripursatu. | uestisa et mefa spefa scalsie conegos fetu Fisoui Sansii popluper totar 38 Iiouinar, totaper Iiouina. suront | naratu, puse post uerir
tesonocir. uestisiar erus ditu. enno uestisia, mefa spefa sopam purome efurfatu, | subra spahamu, traf sahatam etu. ape traha sahata couortus, ennom comoltu, comatir pers40 nihimu. capif || sacra aitu.
trahaf sahate uitla trif feetu Turse S̀erfie S̀erfer Martier popluper totar Iiouinar, totaper Iiouina. persaea fetu. poni fetu. aruio fetu. tases persnimu. prosesetir strus̀la, ficlam arsueitu. suront naratu, puse uerisco treblaneir. ape 43 purdins̀iust, carsitu, pufe abrons facurent, puse erus dersa. ape erus dirsust, postro combifiatu rubiname, erus | dersa. enem traha sahatam combifiatu, erus dersa. enem rubiname 45 postro couertu, comoltu, comatir persnimu et \| capif sacra aitu. enom traha sahatam couertu, comoltu, comatir persnihimu. enom purditom fust.
postertio pane poplo andirsafust, porse perca arsmatia habiest et prinuatur dur tefruto Tursar eso tasetur | persnihimumo: 'Tursa Iouia, totam Tarsinatem, trifo Tarsinatem, 48 Tuscom Naharcom Iapusco nome, totar | Tarsinater, trifor Tarsinater, Tuscer Naharcer Iapuscer nomner nerf sihitu ansihitu, iouie hostatu anostatu | tursitu tremitu, hondu holtu, ninctu nepitu, sunitu sauitu, preplohotatu preuis̀latu.
50 Tursa Iouia, futu fons " pacer pase tua pople totar Iouinar, tote Iouine, erar nerus sihitir ans̀ihitir, iouies hostatir anhostatir, erom | nomne, erar nomne'. este trioper deitu. enom iuenga peracrio tursituto, porse perca arsmatia habiest et | prinuatur. hondra furo sehemeniar hatuto totar pisi heriest. pafe trif promom haburent, eaf acersoniem | fetu Turse Iouie popluper totar Iouinar, totaper Iouina. suront 54 naratu, puse uerisco treblanir. aruio fetu. $/$ persaea fetu. strus̀la, ficla prosesetir arsueitu. tases persnimu. poni fetu. |

[^100]
## 367 Table VII $b$.

Regulation of the Fratres Atiedii to provide the victims for the sacrificial hunt just described.

Pisi panupei fratrexs fratrus Atiersier fust, erec sueso fratrecate portaia seuacne fratrom | Atiersio desenduf, pifi reper fratreca parsest erom ehiato, ponne iuengar tursiandu 3 hertei, | appei arfertur Atiersir poplom andersafust. sue neip portust issoc pusei subra screhto est, | fratreci motar sins in CCC.

## Aes 1 panupeifratrexs fratrusatiersier fusterec. <br> 4) fratrecimotar.

Note xliii. Archaic inscriptions of Pisaurum.
It seems desirable to add here such of the well-known "early Latin" inscriptions of Pisaurum as appear to show local influence, probably that of the Umbrians, since the Senones were exterminated and the Roman colony of Sena Gallica founded in 283 b.c. (Polyb. 2. 19). From this date onwards the whole 'Ager Gallicus' from Ariminum to the Aesis was in Roman hands, and it was divided among Roman settlers by Flaminius in 232 b.c. Hence, as their a $\beta$ suggests, these inscc. may very well be older than 184 b.c. when the town of Pisaurum became a Roman colony. I have taken them from Ritschl's facsimiles P. L. M. E. xliii and xliv.

1. (=C. I. L. $\left.\mathrm{I}^{1} .168\right)$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { cesula |atilia | donu| dat diane } \\
& \wedge \text { and } \wedge a, \| e, レ l, \bigcirc o, 1 t
\end{aligned}
$$

2. (ib. 169)

$$
\begin{gathered}
\text { feronia } \mid \text { sta tetio } \mid \text { dede } \\
\lambda a, E e, F f, \diamond_{o, R r}, \mathrm{~T} t
\end{gathered}
$$

3. (ib. 172)
iunone, with II e, Oo.
4. (C. I. L. $\mathrm{I}^{1} .173$ )
iunone re $\mid$ matrona $\mid$ pisaurese $\mid$ dono dedrot $\wedge a, E e, \Gamma p, R$ and $R r, O$ and $\cap o, T t$.
5. (ib. 174)

$$
\text { lebro (\| e,Ll, } \cap o, R r) \text {. }
$$

6. (ib. 175)
dei mari $\mid$ ca ( $\wedge$ a, E e).
7. (ib. 177)
matre $\mid$ matuta $\mid$ dono dedro $\mid$ matrona
$A$ and $A$ a, $E$ and $\| e, M m, \bigcirc o, R r, T$ and $T t$.
8. (ib.)
m' curia $\mid$ pola liuia $\mid$ deda

$$
\text { A } a, E \text { e, Ll, } W_{m}, \bigcirc o, \Gamma p .
$$

This is clearly a distinct inscription from 7.
9. (ib. 178)

$$
\begin{gathered}
\text { deiu noue sede }|\ldots \ldots \ldots| \underline{t} \text { popaio pop } f \\
\wedge(?) a, E \text { e, } \Gamma p .
\end{gathered}
$$

10. (ib. 179) salute ( $\mathrm{A} a, \mathrm{E} e, \mathrm{~L} l, \mathrm{~T} t)$.

## COINS OF UMBRIA.

Tuder.
a. tutere
c. tut
b. tuter
d. tu

Bronze in blocks, in cast almond-shape coins, and in struck coins from 320 to about $270^{1}$ B.c. both libral and reduced, well executed; Umbr. $\alpha \beta$ in both directions with Y and $\mathrm{X}=t, \mathrm{Q}$ and $\mathrm{D}=r$; for types v . Head p. 18, Beschr. Berl. p. 8 f., Poole p. 36 f. and p. 397, Garrucci Monn. Ital. Ant. pp. 29 and 58, Bücheler Umbr. p. 177.

[^101]
## ikuvins

Cast bronze coins; the inscc. in Umbrian $a \beta$, (1) retrograde with $\beth=v$, and $H$ on one coin (Garr. LVIII. 3), the rest having the reversed $N$ : (2) l. to r. on a few specimens. The legends end in $\langle\mathrm{NI}$ - which is generally read -ins (e.g. Momm.-Bl. II. p. 398 f.), no doubt rightly. On some examples the last letter appears simply as a hasta, sometimes read $-i$; but it is extremely improbable that a pure Latin form, such as Iguvini must be, would be written in an $a \beta$ which had $K=g$ and $[=v$; or that Latin should have been spoken in Iguvium at the date of these coins. 'The exact forms of the letters are often impossible to determine on coins so roughly cast' (B. V. Head, briefich).

For types v. Head p. 18; the commonest are rota solis )( crescent moon and stars, and cornucopiae) (tongs. The standard is modelled on that of the coins of Tuder. Date, before 268 b.c.

Poole p. 30, Bücheler Umbr. p. 177, Garr. p. 30.

## 370 Umbrian Glosses.

## A. Well attested.

pestlic- 'priestess.'
Such, I believe, is the meaning of an epithet in C. I. L. xI. 4212 from Interamna Nahartium (ef. Ose. pestlim 173 sup., Umb. persclo-). The insc. is an epitaph, beginning Noniae T. f. Rufinae pestlici sacr.
ploto- 'pedibus planis.'
Fest. 238 M. (the restorations are Müller's from Paul. $a d$ loc.) <Plotos appellant $>$ Umbri, pedibus planis <natos. Hinc soleas dimidiatas qui $>$ bus utuntur in uenando, <quo planius pedem ponant uo>cant semiplotia et <..... Unde et Acci>us poeta, quia Umber Sarsinas erat, a pedum planitia initio Plotus, postea Plautus coeptus est dici.

The 'poeta' is of course T. Maccius Plautus. I cannot follow Thurneysen (K. Z. 28 p .154 ) in regarding the Umbr. form of the cognomen as the more original (though of course Plautus may have been called Plotus while he lived in Sarsina); see Idg. Forsch. Iv. p. 215 and 255 sup.

For Ocri- 'rnons confragosus' referred to the antiqui by Ateius Philologus ap. Fest. 181 M. see the Glossary s.v.
porculeta 'spatia inter binas uites intermissa' Plin. H. N. 17. 22. 171 (quoted 269 A sup.).
strebula 'coxendices hostiarum.'
Fest. 313 M. and Paul. ad loc. Strebula Umbrico nomine Plautus appellat coxendices hostiarum quas G [raeci $\mu \eta \rho / a$ dicunt, quae] in altaria in[poni solebant, ut Plau]tus ait in Fri [uolaria '.....] agnina tene[.... stre]bulis.'

Valentia 'dea Ocriculana' C. I. L. XI. 4082, Tertull. Apol. c. 24, cited by Borm. ad loc.

The following forms showing Umbrian phonetic characteristics appear in Latin insec. of Umbria C. I. L. xI. part ii.
decatae 'dicatae' (5434).
decrit 'decret(o)' (5614).
famila 'familia' (4488).
magiste (nom. sg. masc., 5183).
Ofentina 'Ufentina' (5702).

## And the dative Bone Dee (4767).

C. Forms less certainly attested but resembling Umbrian words.

The following forms occur in inscc. whose text is not so far beyond doubt as that of those cited above.

5179 (Meuania) L. Leno Totco (? incomplete).
4175 (Interamna Nahartium) Neptuno sacrum L. Valerius Nigri lib. Menander portitor Ocrisiua. This is twice engraved, once on each side of the block, which contains elaborate pictures (1) of Neptune, (2) of three men in a boat, rowing-this on two sides, (3) of a priest sacrificing. On one insc. both the $i$ of the last word are the I longa, on the other they are of ordinary length.

Bormann supposes that the word is the name of a place, in the abl. and connects the first half with Umbr. ocri- 'hill,' Ocricolum etc.

D．Less certain in form or less certainly assigned to Umbria， and showing no specially Umbrian characteristics．
> bananica names of Umbrian vines Plin．14．7．37，the first being also irtiola given by Colum．3．2．28．

dira＇mala＇v． 309 D sup．s．v．
Minerua M［a］tusía（C．I．L．xı．5740，Sentinum）．
？deo Frondisiae（ex uoto feliciter）dat．（5734，Sentinum），if the insc．is complete；if not，Frondisiae may be a nom．pl．
versus＇agri mensura＇v． 153 A sup．
deus Visidianus worshipped in Narnia according to Tertull．Apol． 24.

Note xliv．There should perhaps be quoted a statement of Varro＇s（in his Liber Rerum Humanarum）given by Macrob．Sat．1．3． 4 （and Gell．3．2）Varro．．． scripsit．．．Unbros unum et eundem diem esse dicere a meridie ad insequentem meridiem．Quod quidem，inquit Varro，nimis absurdum est．Nam qui Kalendis hora sexta apud Umbros natus est，dies eius natalis uideri debebit et Kalendarum dimidiatus et qui post Kalendas erit usque ad horam eius diei sextam．The same statement is briefly made by Plin．2．§ 188.

## 371 Place－names of Umbria．

A．Well attested in form，date and locality．
Umbria，Umbri＂ $0 \mu \beta \rho o 九$ ，＇ $0 \mu \beta \rho \iota k$ í in Gr．writers（e．g．Scylax 16），in－ cludes Picenum of．p． 395 sup．；Umber，Umbricus cl．inscc．
Ocric（u）lum，－lani（＇Окрікодо⿱亠䒑，－iк $\lambda$ ou）cl．inscc．Otr－，Utr－，eccles． Lat．Otricoli．

Nār (gen. Nāris insc. cl., Nartis Serv. Aen. 7. 112), masc. fl. La Néraf.
Narnĭa, -ienses cl. inscc. Nárni = the older
$\{$ Nequīnum, -inates cl. insc., cf. Liv. 10.9.
Åmerĭa, -rīnus cl. inscc. Amélia.
Interamna, -ānus cl. (cf. Varr. L. L. 5. 29) inscc. (-a $\mu \nu i ́ a, ~-\iota \nu ~ P t o l ., ~$ and ms. Tac. Hist. 2. 64 and Itinn.); -amnates Nahartes or Nartes Plin. inscc., cf. Umbr. Naharku. Terni.
Carsulae, -lānus cl. inscc. (- $\lambda$ o七 Strab., $-\lambda a$ Dion. Hal.). Casigliáno.
Spōlētium, -ētum, -ētīnus all cl. and inscc.; -lit- late writers, -etanus Priscian 2. 10. 56 (Spōl- Martial, $\Sigma \pi o \lambda$ - Strab., $\Sigma \pi \omega$ - Appian and Ptolemy). Spoléto.
Tŭder, ethnicon -rs (gen. -rtis) cl. (also-єртоע, -єртia), inscc., TŭdSil. It. ; -ertin i inscc., colonia Iulia Fida Tuder C. I. L. XI. 4646 ; cf. Umb. tuderor, and no. 368 supr. Tuder in several inscc. is taken as abl., e.g. C. I. L. xI. 4660, 4748 ; see Bormann, ib. p. 678 foutn. 4. Tódi.

Vicus Martis Tudertium inscc., It. Ant. 311.
Trebia, -iates Plin. 3. 14. 114 (?-ani Suet. Tib. 31), al. and C. I. L. xI. 5055. Trèvi.

Clitumnus Fl., cl. inscc. (Gudius 67. 3 and 4). Clitúnnof. (K.).
Fiscellus mons, cl.
Mēvānĭa, -anates cl. inscc.; -anienses late (Maev- on vases C. I. L. xi. 3283, 3284). Bevágna.

Fulgǐnı̆ae, -inas, -inias cl. inscc. Фоvдкivıov App. B. C. 4. 35; -ginia Silius; Fulc- C. I. L. vi. 2375 i. 9. Folígno.
[Forum Flaminii cl. inscc., probably part of Fulginiae ${ }^{1}$. Profiamma ${ }^{1}$.]
Hispellum, -ellates (colonia Julia Hispellum) cl. inscc. (Eír $\pi$-Strab., 'I $\sigma \pi$ - Ptol.). Spè̀llo.
Vettona, -onenses Plin. 3. 14. 114 inscc. Bettona.
Tĭnĭa Fl. cl. (Tevéas Strab.).
Asisium, Asisinates cl. inscc. Assísi.
Arna, -nates cl. inscc. (Aharna Liv. 10. 25). Civitélla d'Árne.
Heluillum Itinn. inscc. C. I. L. xi. 3281-4, cf. 5801.
Tadinum, -nates Pl. 3. § 114, cf. Umbr. Tadinates and Bormann C. I. L. xi. p. 823.

Nuceria, -кєpia, -cerini cl. (N. Camellaria Tab. Peut. Nucer. Came... insc., Nucerini cognomine Fauonienses et Camellani, Plin. 3. § 114.) Nocèra.
Cāmĕrīnum, -ertes, -ertinus (-rinus late) cl. inscc. Cameríno. Plestini. Pl. 3. 14. 114, C. I. L. x. 5635.
Matilica neut. pl. -cates C. I. L. xI. 5647 al., Pl. 3. 14. 113. Matélica. Tuficum, -cani cl. insc.
*Attidium, Attidiates inscc., ? cf. Umbr. Atiedio-. Attiggio.
$\bar{I} g u ̆ v$ Ĭum, -vini, -vinates cl. inscc. On the Umbr. forms see p. 405 footn. The forms Eugubium, Agubium first appear in ecclesiastical Latin, e.g. Coll. Decr. PP.RR. p. 237 Migne. Gubbio.
Sentīnum cl. inscc. Sentíno.
$\bar{A}$ Apennīnus mons cl. (Apeni- inscc. Appenni- insc.). l'Appennino, gli A.
Pitinum Pisaurense inscc., for its site see Bormann C. I. L. XI. p. 887. Pl. 3. § 114 calls the people of both these towns by a diminutive, Pitulani, cf. Casuentellani=-tini B inf.; the cognomen of the Pisaurenses is corrupted in his text to Pisuertes.
Pitinum Mergens (-ates Mergentini) cl. inscc.; for its site see Bormann C. I. L. xı. p. 876.
Aesis Fl. cl. Fium-esino $f$.
Aesis, -inates cl. inscc. (also Haes-, Hes- C. I. L. xi. 3281--4) (Aïolov Strab. 5. 2. 10). Lesí.
Suāsa, -ani cl. inscc.
Ostra fem., -trani, -trenses cl. inscc., e.g. C. I. L. xт. 5750.
[Petra Pertusa late, e.g. Procop. B. Goth. 4. 28.]
Sēna Fl. Sil. 8. 453, Senna Luc. 2. 407.
Sēna Gallica; Senenses, Senogallienses cl. Senigáglía.
Tifernum Tiberinum, -fernates cl. insec. (Tiferinus ager Lib. Col. 224).
Tifernum Mataurense, -fernates inscc. Plin. 3. 14. 114 (mss. Met-), cf. C. I. L. xı. c. cxi.
Uruinum Mataurense, -inates cl. inscc. (where the spelling is always Urv- and Mat-). Urbíno (see Bormann C. I. L. xI. 6051, 6061 and c. cxiv. Introd.).
[Forum Sempronii, Forosempronienses cl. inscc. Fossombrône.]
Uruinum Hortense C. I. L. xi. 5168 and Pl. 3. 14. 114 Urbanates Metaurenses et Hortenses. It was near Vettona, see Bormann C. I. L. xi. c. lxxxii. Intr.

Vindenates P. 3. 14. 114, C. I. L. xI. 4209.
Forobrentani Pl. 3.14. 113, C. I. L. xı. 6055 (For. Brin. vi. 3884. I. 16).
Sestinum, -inates Pl. 3. 14. 114., inscc. Sestíno.
Mětaurus Fl. cl. (but Mat- Tab. Peut. and on all inscc. in the derivative Mataurensis). Metáuro $f$.
[Fanum (Fortunae) cl. inscc. Fáno.]
Pisaurum,-renses cl. inscc. (Pĭs-Catull. 81.3, Пєı $\sigma$ - Plut., PinsServ. ad Aen. 6. $825^{1}$ ). Pésaro.
Pisaurus Fl. Plin. 3. 14. 113 al.
Sāpis Fl. cl. e.g. Luc. 2. 405.
Sarsina, Sass-, -inates, both forms cl. and inscc. Sarsina.
Ariminus Fl. Pl. 3. 15. 115 al.
Arīmǐnum, -nenses cl. (e.g. Luc. 1. 231) inscc.; nm. Arimn-, a colony of Umbrians seized by the Gauls, Stra. 5. 1. 11. Rimini.
Rŭbǐcō (or cōn), -cōnis Fl., masc. cl.
Răvenna, -ates cl. Ravénna.
Butrium (-pıov) cl., C. I. L. vi. $2379 a 5,51$.
Faventia, -tini cl. insc. Faenza.
Caesēna,-nates cl. insc. Cesèno.
(For the nationality of the inhabitants of these last four places cf. Strab.
5. 2. 10 and Plin. 3. § 115.)

## B. Less certain.

Casuentini insc. from Interamna C. I. L. xx. 4209 ? $=$ Casuentillani Plin. 3. 14. 113.
Ĭsaurus fl. Luc. 2. 405 and Schol. ad loc.
${ }^{1}$ Fabretti Glossar. Ital. s.v. cites 'Charta ap. Muratori. Dissert. vi. 77 and vi. 189 iii.' as containing the spelling Pens-. This reference I cannot identify. It does not appear to be to M.'s 'Dissertazioni sopra le Antichite Italiane.'

Crŭstumĭum Fl. Luc. 2. 406 al.
Mevaniola insc. Henzen Suppl. Orelli 5122 (cf. Mevania supr. A) Pl. 3. 14. 113 Mevanates, Mevanionenses (? leg. -olenses).
Prolaqueum Itin. Ant. p. 312 and Acta Sanctorum Jan. 8 p. 500 ed. 1643. Pioraco.

Solonates Pl. 3. 15. 116 al.
Vici in Ariminum :
Auentinus C. I. L. xi. 421.
Cermalus ib. 419.
Dianensis ib. 379.
For(ensis?) ib. 404.
Velab(rensis) ib. 417.
Cale uicus Itinn. e.g. C. I. L. xI. $3281-4$, Serv. ad Aen. 7. 728.
Ager Tresianus in Ameria, C. I. L. xi. 4488.

## C. Doubtful.

(1) Only in Pliny (3. 14. 112-114):

Apiennates? (al. Sappinates),
Ariates (-ienates Sillig),
Caelestini,
Dolates cognomine Sallentini ${ }^{1}$,
Falinates?,
Feliginates,
Forojulienses cogn. Concupienses,
Paesinates,
Plangenses,
Sarranates,
Solinates ( $?=$ Solon-),
Suillates ?Sigillo,
Suriates,
${ }^{1}$ Cf. 25 A. Rem.

Usidicani,
Vesinicates,
Visuentani,
Acerrae Vafriae (? Vatr-),
Clusiolum,
Criniuolum,
Turocaelum quod Vettiolum.
(2) Elsewhere:

Clăsis Fl., alii Clănis or Clasia Sil. 8. 453. Chiascio f. Novanus Fl. Pl. 2. 102, 229.
[ad Pirum It. Anton. p. 316 and 560.]
Luceoli It. Anon. Rav. and Paul. Diac. Hist. Langob. 4.8 and 38.
Misus Fl. Tab. Peut. Misa f. (K.).
Nelurum ?? Tab. Peut.
Rustunum?? fl. Tab. Peut.
Movtєфєрє́т $\quad$ o $\operatorname{Procop.~B.~Goth.~2.~} 11=$ Mons Feletes Eugippus Vit. S. Severini 44. Sasso Feltrio.
A prusa Fl. Plin. 3. 15. 115 (? cf. gens A prucia C. I. L. x. 5337).
[Fanum Fugitiui Itinn.]
[Tres Tabernae It. Hieros. p. 613.]
[Forum Flaminii Itinn.]
Cumerus M. (inland) Vib. Seq. p. 15. M. Comero.
Materina near Mevania Liv. 9. 41.

## D. Further modern names.

Cálvi dell' Úmbria, Renzáno, Messenáno, Acqua Sparta, Maroggia F., Serraválle, M. Penníno, Topino F., Carpina F., Arcevia, Nevola F., Pérgola, Cágli, Montalboddo, Mondavio, Badia, M. Carpégna, Carignáno, Riccione, Uso F., Savignáno.

## 372 Personal names ${ }^{1}$ of Umbria ${ }^{2}$.

|  | A. Frequent. |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| gens Aelia | Egnatia | Plotia |
| Aemilia | Flauia | Pomponia |
| Aetria | Fuficia | Pontia |
| Alfia cf. inf. | Fullonia | Popilia (once -ill-) |
| Allia inf. | Furia | Propertia - |
| Annia | Gellia | Publicia |
| Antonia | Geminia (once -mn-) | Roscia passim |
| Arria (Aria) | Heluia inf. | Rubria |
| Arruntia (Arun-) | Iulia passim | Rustia |
| Attia | Laberia | Rutilia |
| Aufidia | Licinia | Satria cf. inf. |
| Aurelia $(g, l)$ | Maesia | Statia inf. |
|  | Marcia | Terentia |
| Autronia Baebia | Maria | Tettia |
| Caecilia | Masonia | Titia |
| Caesia | Mimisia | Valeria |
| Camuria | Nonia inf. | Varia |
| Casidia | Numisia cf. inf. | Vedia (often with e marked long) |
| $\overline{\text { Cassia }}$ (Casia) | Octauia cf. inf. Orfia (once -ph-) | marked long) <br> Vespria |
| Claudia | Orfia (once -ph-) <br> Papiria | Vettia (Vetia) |
| Coelia | Petillia | Veturia |
| Coiedia | Petisia | Vibia inf. |
| Cominia inf. <br> Coretia | Petronia | Vilia (-11-? in oneinsc.) |
| Cornelia | Pisentia | Vlpia |
| Decia inf. | Pisentia | Volcasia |

${ }^{1}$ For the arrangement and notation see the List of Signs and Abbreviations.
${ }^{2}$ From C. I. L. xi. 4081 - 6212 (the proofs of which were very kindly sent me by Prof. Bormann) and Kaibel 2249-54. Without the aid of an index I did not think it worth while to attempt a collection of the cognomina; Causus (4184 and 5758), Masura (4276, 4195), Tifanus (4587), Venesauos (4150) are peculiar to the district, and may perhaps be mentioned here as forms of interest (Causus if it be, as seems probable (cf. Caeso, caedo), the partic. of *caudo (Lat. incudo, excudo, cudo) establishes the derivation of caussa suggested in Verner's Law in Italy p. 72) ; Rufus and its derivatives are of course abundant in Umbria as elsewhere.

## B. Less frequent.

| gens Aburia | Caelia | Eccurneia? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Acadia (one insc.) | Caesolia | Eleuria (once Ael-) |
| Aconia | Caesonia | Elufria (one inse.) |
| Addia | Calidia (one insc.) | Epidia inf. |
| Aequasia (one insc.) | Callia (one insc.) | Eronia (one insc.) |
| Aerussia (one insc.) | Calpurnia | Erutia (one insc.) |
| Aetia | Caluedia (one insc.) | Fabricia |
| Albia (one insc.) | Caluentia | Fadia |
| Alennia (once -enia) | Caluisia | Faustia |
| Alleia (once, and once | Camonia | Fiscilia |
| Ale-) | Camurena | Flauennia (one inse.) |
| Alliena (once, and | Canuleia | Fuluia |
| once Ale-) | Capidas (one insc.) | Gabinia |
| Ampia | Caseria | Gallia |
| Ancharia (one insc.) | Caspertia (one insc.) | Gargonia (once Care-) |
| Aninia | Castricia inf. | Gauia |
| Annıea | Casuria | Gessia |
| Annea (once -neia) | Catia |  |
| Antistia | Cauia (one insc.) | Graecinia |
| Aponia | Cesidia | Graia (one insc.) |
| Appaea (one insc.) | Cestia | Grania |
| Appia | (Clementiana) | Gresia |
| Appuleia (once Apu-) | Clodia (once -deia) | Gutia (one insc.) |
| Apronia | Clodiena | Hedia |
| Artoria (one insc.) | Clutoria (one insc.) | Heidia |
| Asinia | Cluuia | Heldia (one insc.) |
| Atiedia sup. | Cocceia inf. | Heluenatia (oneinsc.) Heluidia (one insc.) |
| Atilia (once -llia) | Comnena (one insc.) | Herennia inf. |
| Atinatia (once -nas) | Cosconia (one insc.) |  |
| Attidia cf. sup. | Cotla (one insc.) | Hirpia |
| Atullia (one insc.) | Cuppiena | Hoenia |
| Aufidena | Curiatia |  |
| Auidia | Cusinia | Iantia (one insc.) Tauclena |
| Auiena | Cuspia (one insc.) | Iunia |
| Auillia | Cutia | Iuventia |
| Aulia | Decimia | Lappia |
| Ausidia (one insc.) | Dexia |  |
| Babudia $l$. | Didia | Larinata (one insc.) |
| Baebidia | Dionysia | Larinata (one insc.) <br> Lartia |
| Birronia (one insc.) | Disinia | Lateria |
| Bruttia (once Bri-) | Doia | Latuedia |
| Bruttiena | Domitia | Laudicia |


| Leria | Papia ? (one insc.) | Suernia (one insc.) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Liconia (one insc.) | Pennasia (once, and | Sulpicia |
| Liguria (one insc.) | once Pena-) | Talonia |
| Lisennia (one insc.) | Pettia | Taminia |
| Lissidia | Pinaria | Tarquitia |
| Liuia | Pompeia | Terta(u)a (one insc., |
| Longenitu (one insc.) | Pompullia | in masc. Tertaus) <br> Tertullia (once, and |
| Luccia (once and once | Pompusidia (one | once -ulia) |
| Lucia) | inse.) | Tettiena |
| Lucilia | Popo-) | Tifania |
| Lusena | Praecilia (one insc.) | Tifernia |
| Lusia cf. inf. | Praeconia | Tittiena (once, and |
| Lutatia (one insc.) | Praesentia | once Titi-) |
| Maena (one insc.) | Precia | Trauia |
| Magia | Publilia | Trebatia |
| Mallia | Pupia | Trisimpedia (one |
| Massellia (one insc.) | Quintia (once -nct-) | insc.) |
| Matinia (one insc.) | Quintilia (one insc.) | Truttidia cf. inf. |
| Matrinia | Raia (one insc.) | Tullia |
| Mattetia (one insc.) | Rantifana | Turpilia |
| Memmia | Rufria | Turrena (once, and |
| Messia (once Mesia l.) | Sabinia | once Ture-) |
| Mestria | Safinia inf. | Tusidia |
| Metella | Sallustia | Tutia (one insc.) |
| Meuanas $l$. | Saluena | Valia (once -11-) |
| Milionia (one insc.) | Saluia cf. inf. | Vania l. (one insc.) |
| Mimesia (one insc.) | Satrena | Varena |
| Minicia (one insc.) | Satrinia | Varonia |
| Munisia $l$. (one insc.) | Scaefeia | Vasselia (once -11-) |
| Murria | Scaereia | Vassidena |
| Musana l. (one insc.) | Scetasia | Veiaca |
| Musetia cf. inf. | Secia | Veiania |
|  | Seia inf. | Veiedia |
|  | Sentia | Veiena (one insc.) |
| Naria (one insc.) | Sentinas | Veneria |
|  | Septimia | Venia (once, and once |
| Offellia (once, once | Seria | -nn-) |
|  | Sertoria (once Set-) | Ventidia |
| Ofellia, and once | Seruenia | Vesennia (one insc.) |
| ${ }^{\prime} O \phi(\lambda \lambda \cos )$ | Sibidiena | Vesia |
| Orbia | Silia inf. |  |
| Otacilia | Soconia (one insc.) | Vesnia |
| Ottiedia | Sosia | Vessidia (one inse.) |
| Paccia inf. | Spuria (one insc.) | Vibusia |
| Palia l. (one insc.) | Statilia (once -11-) | Virgi[n]ia (one insc.) |

Visena
Vistilia
Vistinia (Veist- once)
Vitoria inf.
Volaneria
Volcacia
Vollia $l$. (one insc.)
Volteia
Volumnia
Volusena

Volusia
Vrania $(g, l)$
Vrsia (once, and once
Urssi...)
Uttiedia (once Utted-)

## C. Once only.

| gens Abeiena | Aufidiena? | Cissuitia |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Abulenia | Auiedia | Classia |
| Abundantia | Autia | Clusinatia |
| Accaea | Badusia | Coden[nia? |
| (Acceiana) | Bantia | Codonia |
| Accia | Beriena | Cominiena |
| Acilia | Bettuedia | Conetania |
| Aco (nom. sg. masc.) | Bouiana | Cordia |
| Adurena | Braetia | Coreliat... |
| Aebutia | Buccidia | Corellia |
| Aeclania | Burbuleia | Coria |
| Aiasia | Caedia | Crastina |
| Alfacia? | Caepia | Crathia |
| Alfena | Caesaria | Cremellia |
| Alfenia | Caetennia | Crepereia |
| Alfidena | Caetronia $l$. | Curtilia |
| Amantia | Cafatia | Curuia |
| Amilia | Caiolia | Cuspedia |
| Amoeniana | Callistana | Decumena |
| Aniciana | Caltinia | Dentusia |
| Anteia | Camidiena | Deuia |
| Appaedia | Cancrial. | Diuiliena |
| Appionia | Canena | \{Dursubia\} |
| Aprilia | Canidia | \{Durunia $\}$ |
| Aquillia | Cannutia? | Edusia |
| Arrena | Cantinia | Egnatiena |
| Arronia | Cāpia | Eleria? |
| Asania | Caprilia | Ermonia |
| Asudia | Carfania | Etusia |
| Asullia | Carpelana | Euresia |
| Asullia | Carpiana? | Fabia |
| Atatia | Carulia | Faelia |
| Ateia | Castrucia | Falia |
| Atelia | Catellia $l$. | Faltonia |
| Audacilia | Catilia | Fania |
| Audia inf. | Ceruonia | Felicia |
| Aufeia | C]issonia | Ferentiana |


| (Festiana) | Larena? | Orestiniana |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Filionia $l$. | Lartiena | Orfidia |
| Firmia | Latieli... | Ouitia |
| Firmidia | Latinia | Paetia |
| Flatedia | Lauuia | Paetilia |
| Florentia | Lesia | Paetina |
| Floria - | Letteia | Paiedia |
| Foenia | Ligustinia | Papinia |
| Foesulena | Lindia | Parconia |
| Folia | Lollia | Parredia |
| Fremedia | Longuria | Passenna (th |
| Frontiniana | Maceriana | person Pl. |
| Fufidia | Maecia inf. | 15, 9. 22) |
| Fulia? | Maenia | Pederni...? |
| Furfana | Maeuia | Pedia |
| Furfania | Mamilia | Pedilia |
| Guleria | M $]$ ammedia | Pedisia |
| Gallienia | Maneia | Peducael... |
| Gargilia | Manilia | Pensia? |
| Gauennia | Marruca | Pescennia |
| Gestiana | Marsidia | Pipedia? |
| Graecina | Marsina $l$. | Pisena |
| Hria? | Martucana | (Placidiana) |
| Hateria | Massilia? | Plautia inf. |
| Heraclia | Mateniana | Plinia |
| Herena | M]ateuria | (Plotidiana) |
| Herennena | Matia? <br> Mectonia | Poinisia |
| Hergenia | Mettia | Pollia |
| Hertoria |  | Polliena $l$. |
| Hilariana | Mineruia | Possidena |
| Hispella | Minia inf. | Porceial $l$. |
| Hortensia | Musaea | Postinia |
| Hortoria (spelt Ort-) | Museia? | Protial. |
| Hostillia | Museia? | Publia |
| Itia |  | Pulionia |
| Iulen[ia] | (Naeuidiana) | Puplia? |
| Iunenia | Nasennia | Quaestoria |
| Laccaea | Nassia l. | Rania |
| Laetilia | $\frac{\text { Nassia lir }}{}$ | Ranti[f]enia? |
| Laetorial. | Nunnia | Rasenia? |
| Lafrenia |  | Rasinia? |
| Lamia (masc.) | Ofitulena | Resia |
| Lania |  | (Restiana) |
| Laniuia | O[g]ulnia Opellia | Romania |
| Lanuuia | Oppia l. inf. | Rubrania <br> Rufellia |


| Rufia | Suria | Velia |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (Rufiniana) | Sutisia $l$. | Veltia |
| Ruspuleia | Talasia l. (i.e. Tha- | Venecia |
| Sabidia cf. inf. | lass-) | Venedia |
| Sabina | Tameia | Venelia |
| Saenia | Taquia | Veratia |
| Sagura | Tatial $l$ | Verecundinia |
| Salaria | Tebedana | Vergilia |
| Salonina | Temonia | Vernasena |
| Sappinia | Teria | Vernasia |
| Satriuia | Tiburtia | Verran. |
| Sauf. | T[i]diena | Verrea |
| Scantia | Tillia | Vesidiena |
| Scaudia | Tinia (nom. masc.) | Ves[t]iniana |
| Sceidia | Tintiria? inf. | Vestuleia |
| Segulia | Tiresia (nom, masc. | Vibenn[ia] |
| Seiena | -resius) | Vibula[nia] |
| Selia | Titellia | Vidia |
| Sempronia | Titratia | Vindleia? |
| Septimena | Torasia | Virgilia |
| Sergia | Trebellia | Virusia |
| Sertulla | Turia | Visellia |
| Seruiena | Turpedia | Visennia |
| Seruiliz | Turpidia | Visuina? |
| Sessia | Turrania | Vitellia |
| Seuerinia | Tutila | Vitruuia |
| Somnisia | Vaberia <br> Valentiniana | Vmbricia |
| Soumisia l.? | Valgia | Vmmidia |
| Spedia inf. | Varatia | Voesidena? |
| Stertinia | Varisidia | Volsiena |
| Storgenia? (in dat, | Varrutia? | Voluntilia |
| Storgeni) | Varsedia | Vossia |
| Succonia <br> Sueiedena | Vassia | Vrbenea |
|  | Vatenia | Vrsilia |
| Suilla | Vdisia | Vrticia? |
| Suillia | Vedonia? | Vruinia |

[^102]Velia
Veltia
Venecia
Venedia
Venelia
Veratia
Verecundinia
Vergilia
Vernasena
Vernasia
Verran...
Verrea
Vesidiena
Ves[t]iniana
Vestuleia
Vibenn[ia]
Vibula[nia]
Vidia
Vindleia?
Virgilia
Virusia
Visellia
Visennia
Visuina?
Vitellia
Vitruuia
Vmbricia
Vmmidia
Voesidena?
Volsiena
Voluntilia
Vossia
Vrbenea
Vrsilia
Vrticia?
Vruinia
C. a. Add to these
C. Cassinius Schola Cic. Milon. § 46.

## VII. Picenum.

One or two Latin inscc. of Picenum show forms which vary from normal Latin, but their relation to it may be different from those, which have been grouped under 'Latinian' in 260 351 sup. In central western Italy we have seen that the local patois may fairly be regarded as not less native to the soil than the idiom to which they gradually gave way; but in Picenum we have no means of determining the character of the dialect spoken before Latin spread over the district in the III century b.c. save the forms in Note xlv and the Place- and Personal names (cf. p. 395 sup. and Picenum 373 A inf.). Picenum was conquered about 268 b.c. (Liv. Epit. xv.) and the Roman occupation, which spared only Asculum, was completed by the Lex Flaminia (de agro Piceno et Gallico uiritim diuidundo) of 232 b.c.

## Note xlv. Local forms in Latin inscc. of Picenum.

## Picenum.

a. C. I. L. IX. 5565 Tesseram paganicam L. Veratius felicissimus patronus pagi Tolentines hostias lustr(ales) et tes$\operatorname{ser}(a \mathrm{~m})$ aer (eam) ex uotol.d.d. v. Id. Mas. (?) felicit(er).
b. Ibid. 5350 (Firmum) L. Pescenius Mircurio d. d. m.
c. Ibid. 5803 (Cluentum) Maxima Nasia Cn. f. Apolline dat.
d. Not. Scav. 1895 p. 413 (Cellino, west of Atri) M. Petrusdi C. f., I. Pasdi P. [f.] aras crepidine co[l]u[mnasque...magistris de A[1]ec[anorum? scitu fac. coir.].

The insc. is noteworthy for the special sign $q=\delta$, which is clearly a variety of the Umb. $d$, and for the change of the gutturals before $i$ and the subsequent syncope, which the two names show and which vouch for the survival of a certain Umbrian element in the language of the district even in the II century, to which the $a \beta$ belongs.

## 373. COINS OF HATRIA.

See Head Hist. Num. p. 19 ff.

## hat

Lat. $a \beta$ in both directions; bronze, of many different types, all later than the foundation of the Latin colony in 289 B.c. v. Head p. 20, Garrucci Mon. Ital. Antic. p. 33. For dialectic influence in the coins of a Latin colony cf. 159 and 185 sup.

## 374 Place-names ${ }^{1}$ of Picenum ${ }^{2}$.

## A. Well attested in form, date and locality.

Pīcēnum, Pīcens, Pīcentīnus, Pīcēnus all cl. inscc. (Picenesis later insc.); for the etymon cf. Stra. 5. 4. 1, who gives the traditional derivation from the picus, sacred to Mars, which led them into their territory from Sabine country; cf. Dion. Hal. 1. 14. 5.
Matrinus Fl. (-îvos) cl.
Hadria cl. insce. 'A $\delta \rho i a ́$ Stra. Ptol.; cf. nm. 373 sup. with Hat. C. I. L. I. 6, and all inscc. show the H. Cf. Mom. C. I. L. v. p. 220 , ix. p. 480. Átri.
Vŏmānum Fl. cl. Vománo.
[Castrum Novum, Castrum, -ranus cl.]
Interamnia, -ites Ptol. 3. 1. 58 al. inscc. (often adding Praetuttiorum) -nium C. I. L. vI. 3824; once miswritten -amna, -amnates in Lib. Colon., by confusion with Interamna Volscorum and I. Umbrorum. Téramo.

Trŭentus Fl. cl. Trónto $f$.
Trŭentum, Castrum Truentinum el. inscc.
Praetuttii, -tianus C. I. L. Ix. 5066 ; in 7th cent. A.D. Aprutium (Kiep.) $=$ mod. Abruzzo 'the whole central mountain land of Italy'; -tūt- and -tutt- cl. (-лeтt- Polyb.); their territory lay between the Vomanum and Tessinnus PI. 3.110, and therefore included Castrum Novum, Interamnia and the Truentus, as well as probably the original of Hadria.
Asculum, -clum, -clanus cl. insce. (never Ausce, contrast no. 29 supr.). Áscoli.
Cupra Montana, -prenses Montani cl. insce.
Cupra Maritima, -prenses Maritimi cl. insce., cf. Strabo 5. 4.2
 Kútpà ка入ov̄б九. Dea Cupra appears in this town C. I. L. Ix. 5294 and in Sil. It. 8. 434, but Mars Cyprius on an insc. from Gubbio (Mom. U.D. p. 350), and cf. rather cipro- 309 D sup. and cubrar matrer 354 sup. which point to a pure Italic word.
Pausulae, -anus cl. inse.

[^103]Falerio, -lerienses inscc.; -larienses Pl. 3. 13. 111; -lerionenses Lib. Col. Faleróne.
Firmum, -anus cl. inscc. Férmo.
$\{$ Urbs Saluia, -bisaluienses cl. inscc. Urbiságlia.
Pollentia, -tini cl., the earlier name of Urbs Saluia.
Septempĕda,-anus cl.
Tollentinum, -nates cl. insc. Tolentino.
Treia, Treiensis cl. inscc. Treia.
Ricina insc., -inenses cl., cf. mod. Recanáti.
Planina inscc. (e.g. C. I. L. vi. 2379 a i. 7), -inenses Pl. 3. 13. 111.
Potentia Fl. et oppid., -ntinus cl. Poténza.
Cingŭlum, -lanus, -lus cl. insc. Cingoli (K.).
Auxŭmum, -umates (also -im-) cl. insce. Ósimo.
Nŭmāna,-ates cl. insc. Numána (older Umána).
Ancōn fem. (acc. -ōna Catull. 36. 13), also fem. sing. Ancona, -onitani cl. inscc. (乏vpaкooi iш ктí $\mu a$ Stra. 5. 4. 1). Ancóna.
Cunerus Prom. Pl. 3. 13. 111, Cunar-Serv. Aen. 10. 185. M. Conero.

## B. Less certain.

Palmensis ager Plin.
Pagus Veheia... (Cuprensium) C. I. L. IX. 5699.
Aspia Fl. Tab. P. Aspio $f$.

## C. Doubtful.

Pǐcānus mons (may be anywhere) Sil. Ital. 4. 302, possibly imitated by
Avien. Perieg. 499, who has Pīceènus.
Batinum Fl. Pl. 3. 13. 110 (Bath- Velleius 2. 114).
Albula Fl. Pl. 3. 13. 110. F. dell' Álbero (K.).
Beregra, -ani Pl. 3. 13. 111 (Ver-Lib. Col. 2. 126).
$\left.\begin{array}{l}\text { Heluinum Fl. ? } \\ \text { Tessinnum Fl. Tesinof.(K.). }\end{array}\right\}$ Pl. 3. 13. 110, v. Mom. C.I. L. rx. p. 479.
Tinna Fl. Tab. P. Tenna $f$.

Vidicini in Piceno Plin. 3. 12. 108.
Cluana Pl. 3. 13. 111 al. ? cf. vicus Cluentensis C. I. L. Ix. 5804, cf. Mom. ib. p. 554 and mod. Chientif.
Nouana Pl. 3. 13. 111.
Flusor Fl. Tab. P., ?=Flosor (oppidum) It. Rav. 5. 1. p. 326.
Misius Fl. Tab. P.
Sacrata Tab. P.
Flosis Fl. Tab. P.
Miscus Fl. Tab. P.
D. Further modern names.

Fíno f., Bisénti, Tossiccia, Brozzi, Montório, Preta, Capricchia, Basciáno, Scorráno, Nepezzano, Cámpli, Morge, Mavone f., Neréto, Tortoréto, Bellánte, Gésso, Campovalano, Trisungo, Cavaceppo, Corropoli, Ancaráno, Folignáno, Polesio, Venarotta, Fichieri, Capradósso, Ripatransóne, Comunanza, Offida, M. Prandone (K.), Ragnola f. (K.), Paritoli (K.), Massignano, Aso, Campofilone, Altidona, Menocchia f., Entoggi f. (K.), L'Etemarta f., Lapedona, Belförte, Montecosaro, Morrovalle, Maceráta, Aliforni, Acquaro, Filottrano, Montoro, Musone f., T'apignano (K.), Staffolo, Appignano.

## 375 Personal Names ${ }^{1}$ of Picenum ${ }^{2}$.

## A. Frequent.

I. Nomina.

| gens Annia | Clodia | Herennia (rarely |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\overline{\text { Attia }}$ | Decimia | -enia) |
| $\overline{\text { Aufidia }}$ | Domitia | Iulia |
| Aurelia $(g, l)$ | Epidia inf. | Licinia |
| Baebia | Fadena | Marcia |
| Caecilia | Feronia | Naevia (once Neuia) |
| Caesia | Flauia | Nonia cf. inf. |
| Claudia | Gauia | Numisia cf. inf. |

[^104]375 A, B PERSONAL NAMES OF PICENUM. 453

| Octavia cf. inf. | Publicia | Titia |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Oppia cf. inf. | Saluia | Tuccia |
| Petillia (once -ilia) | Saturia | Tullia |
| Petronia cf. inf. | Scaefia (Sce-) | Tusidia |
| Plotia | Sentia | Valeria |
| Pompeia | Septimia (-tum-) | Vettia |
| Pomponia | Statia inf. | Vibia inf. |
| Praesentia | Tamudia | Volcacia |

2. Among the Cognomina may be mentioned

| Bassus $l$. | Rufus $l$. | Rufinus |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Ianuarius $l$. | Rufillus |  |
| Proculus (-cl-) |  |  |

B. Less Frequent.

| Aconia | Calpurnia | Didia |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Acusia l. (one insc.) | Caluia cf. inf. | Disellia (one insc.) |
| Aelia | Caluisia | Duruia $l$. |
| Aiedia (one inse.) | Calusia | Egnatia |
| Albia | Cameria | Ennia |
| Allia | Camuria | Eppia |
| Ambiuia | Caninia | Fadia |
| Ampia | Capiua ${ }^{\text {? }}$ ? | Faesonia |
| Ampiidia | Cardena (one insc.) | Floria |
| Ancharia | Cassia | Freia |
| Anicia | Ceionia | Fresidia |
| Aninia, | Cennia $l$. (one inse.) | Fufia |
| Annalia inf.? | Cernitia | Fuficia |
| Anteia <br> Antonia | Cincia | Fuluia |
| [Ar]redia (one insc.) | Clepia $l$. | Furia |
| Arria | Cluuia | Gargonia |
| Arruntia | Cocce | Gauillia |
| Atalia | Coelia | Geminia |
| Ataua | Cominia inf. | Heluia inf. |
| Atellia | Coponia | Hermonia |
| Atriena $l$. | Cornasidia | Isutia? (one doubtful |
| Aufidena | Cornelia | Iunia |
| Auillia (once -ilia) | Cusinia | Labiena |
| Baiania $l$. (one insc.) | Dentria (one insc.) | Laetoria |

${ }^{1}$ Six times in Ix. 5016, both as masc. and fem.

C. 1. Nomina.
Abnatia
Accaua cf. inf.
Accia
Acilia
Acutia
Aebutia $(g)$
Aelania $l$.
Afrania
Afrenia

Afria
Agusia
Allenia
Alfia
Alficia?
Alfiena
Alfinus
Alinia

Suedia
Sulpicia
Sutria
Telonia (one insc.)
Terentia
Tettaeal.
Tettia
Tigidia
Trebellia
Truttedia (one insc.)
Tulliena
Turcia
Turpidia (once -ped-)
Tuscilia
Varia
Vassia
Veidia
Veiena
Veltia $l$.
Veturia
Voconia
Volusia
Vssia

Strobilus
Vibius praen. Vrsus

[^105]| Apisia | Cingulana? | Mahena |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Aponia | Cintia | Mallia |
| Appalia | Ciprinia | Manilia |
| Appeia | Cirpinia | Marcilia |
| Appuleia | Considia | Masuuia |
| Appusulena | Cossinia <br> Crasicina ? | Matrin[ia] |
| Aprufenia | Crispinia | Meclonia $l$. Mellia |
| Arrena | Curuia | Memmia |
| Arsinia $l$. | Cuspedia | Memmia |
| Artoria | Dasia | Mesena? |
| Asinia | Demetria | Milasia |
| Atafnia ? | Detellia | Modia |
| Atilia | Diania | Modiaria 1. |
| Atitria? | Dolania | Molletia |
| Attedia | Dossennia | Murridia |
| Audiena | Ebelana? | Mussena ${ }^{\text {l }}$ |
| Auidia | Fannia | Nasia |
| Babidenus | Fistana | Neria |
| Babiena? | Flauonia | Norbana $l$. |
| Babrenus l. | Fuionia | Nouellia |
| Basilia? | Fulcinia | Nouernia |
| Betuia | Fundilia | Obilena |
| Biallia ? | Fusia | Obultronia |
| Blannia | Gellia | Ocbrotsinia |
| Brittia | $\overline{\text { Geneia }}$ | Ofa... |
| Bruttia | Gentia | Orbicia $l$. |
| Brutsena | Grassia | Pacuuia |
| Buxuria | Gratia | Paetinia |
| Cadia | Heiuleia l. (one insc.) | Pantilial. <br> Papiria |
| Caepania | Hortesia | Pediena |
| Caepionia | Hostilia | Pedilla |
| Caesonia | Iuuentis | Pescenia |
| Caetronia |  | Peticia inf. |
| Caleida[na ?] | Laecania | Petillena |
| Calidena | Laf[renia] | Petulcia |
| Calpena |  | Plania |
| Campania inf. | Larsia | Plaria |
| Campilia | Laticia | Platoria |
| Camurena? | Latinia | Pleto[ria] |
| Cardana | Latronia | Pomponena |
| Carfinia | Lattia | Pontiena |
| Carpinaria | Lictoria? | Pontilia |
| Carsedia | Licustena <br> Lucretia | Pontulena |
| Cassidia | Maetennia $l$. | Popilia |
| Catinia | Magia | Pumidia |


| Pupiena | Taflenia l. | Vesennia |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Rabiria | Tampia | Vesta nom. fem. |
| Rasinia | Tarquinia | Vetedia |
| Rogia? | Tarutia | Vetiedia $l$. |
| Romatia | Tedia | Vetilia |
| Rufertia | Temonia | Vettiena |
| Rutilia | Terebia | Vettina |
| Sacella? | Terminia | Vibolena |
| Salena | Tettaiena | Viciria |
| Sanguria | Tinnania | Vicrena $l$. |
| Sapsa? | Tonnia | Vifia |
| Satura | Trebia inf. | Vilon... |
| Seiana l. | Turpilia | Vindia |
| Sentidia | Tusia | Vinulei... |
| Septinena | Vallia | Viria inf. |
| Serania | Varena | Vitoria l. inf. |
| Setria $l$. | Vauilia | Vlpia? |
| Sileia? | Vecilia? | Vmbricia |
| Simnia | Vegetia | Volia |
| Sollia | Veiania | Volu... |
| Sornatia | Veneria $l$. | Volumnia $l$. |
| Spetinia, $l$. | Ventidia $l$. | Votiena |
| Statoria | Veratia | Vtiaca |
| Stla.... | Verginia |  |
| Stritia |  |  |

2. Among the Cognomina.

Abinnaeus
Apra
Asprenas
Bauto
Camars
Cerio vir
Corbulo
Oorinthus

| Damala |
| :--- |
| Eglectus |
| Lucumo |
| Mamulla vir |
| Maro |
| Ofellius |
| Pet[ro]? |

Plator
Pollitta
Rufio $l$.
Russinus
Samera
Silo
Suetia

END OF VOLUME I.
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[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ In his note on C.I.L. $\mathrm{I}^{1}$. 197.

[^1]:    Aurunci, Hernici, Pollusca, Etrusci, Falisci etc.) ; cf. Sidi-ci-ni, Marru-ci-ni where the order of the suffixes is significant.
    ${ }^{1}$ The affinities of the dialects in point of Rhotacism were illustrated by a map by Mr Edward Heawood, M.A., F.R.G.S., in Verner's Law in Italy, published in 1887.
    ${ }^{2}$ I have omitted several forgeries which have long since dropped out of notice; such as were given in the editions of Buicheler and Zvetaieff will be found in the Appendix.
    ${ }^{3}$ To some inscc. I have given the benefit of a doubt; notably 132. But some account of the intercourse of the Etruscans with the Italic tribes was of course necessary, cf. pp. 310 f., 395,459 ff., and 407 footn.

[^2]:    ${ }^{1}$ According to Zvetaieff's statement. But no such suggestion appears in the article in the Jena Lit. Zeit.

[^3]:    ${ }^{1}$ esum is gen. plur. of esei on the Cipp. Abell. and $=$ Umbr. erom. The clause [pis e] sum nerum fust would be a second definition of the persons ineligible for the tribunate, limiting the first, the limit no doubt referring chiefly to the quaestors, not all of whom were to be ineligible, but only those who had been esum nerum, v. Lange p. 27 ff.

[^4]:     26 A sup.

[^5]:    D. Further modern names.

    Punta della Ristola, Patu, Monteróni di Lecce, Porto S. Catáldo, Trepuzzi, S. Piet. Vernótico, Tuturano, Meságne.
    ${ }^{1}$ The modern name Grumo (Appula), with which he would connect them, and its derivatives are of frequent occurrence all over Italy, see the Dizzionaria Postale s.v. Helbig Hermes xi. p. 261 mentions a town Grumum but on what authority I do not know.

[^6]:    ${ }^{1}$ For the arrangement and notation see the List of Signs and Abbreviations.
    ${ }^{2}$ The tables of the Itineraries for Apulia are given C. I. L. Ix. pp. 25-6. For the boundary between Daunia and Peucetia, see above p. 22 footn.

[^7]:    ${ }^{1}$ For the origin of this tribe and of severail place-names in the district, see
    A Rem.
    ${ }^{2}$ Mommsen (U. D. p. 103) notes that the Apuli were regularly (e.g. Liv. 9. 13) allied with the Samnites, whereas the Dauni and Arpani were as regularly joined with the Romans.

[^8]:    ${ }^{1}$ For the arrangement and notation see the List of Signs and Abbreviations.

[^9]:    ${ }^{1}$ Excluding these three Messapian glosses;
     $\beta \rho^{\epsilon} \nu \delta o \nu$. $\begin{gathered}\text { è } \lambda a \phi o \nu \text { cf. supr. Brundisium. }\end{gathered}$
    тavós, äpros, Mevodítoo Athen. 3 p. 111 c.

    - I have inserted between [】 two glosses whose form is clearly Greek, on the chance that they may represent some Italic term used for the same thing.

[^10]:    ${ }^{1}$ See the introduction to the inscc. of Cumaes, p. 83 inf .
    ${ }^{2}$ Beloch Campanien p. 239.

[^11]:    ${ }^{1}$ Mommsen C. I. L. l.c. would refer to the Nucerine senate the Osci ludi of Cicero's letter to Marius (Fam. 7. 1. 3).
    E.g. Pausan. 8. 7. $3 \Delta \iota x a l a \rho \chi l a ~ \dot{\eta} T v \dot{\rho} \eta \eta \nu \bar{\nu}$.
    ${ }^{3}$ Steph. Byz. refers to Tyrrhenia also Picentia, Puteoli, Suessa, Pithekussae and Nuceria, quoting the last from the historian Philistus, a contemporary of the younger Dionysius. Sophocles (Triptol. fr. 527 Dind.) extends Tyrrhenia from Oenotria (see $11 \Delta$ sup.) to Liguria, and Euripides (Med. 1349, 1356) puts Scylla in Tuponvд̀ $\pi \in$ ह̣ov. Of. 37 e supp.

[^12]:    ${ }^{1}$ But see also p. 109 f.

[^13]:    ${ }^{1}$ Nissen Pomp. Stud. p. 381, Mommsen C. I. L. x. p. 90.

[^14]:    ${ }^{1}$ Indog. Forschungen III. p. 85 as against Nissen Pomp. Stud. p. 492.
    2 The sign commonly read INER (C. I. L. IV. 50, 54, 56, 70) should perhaps be taken as the Oscan title of the duovirate (IINER).
    ${ }^{3}$ Beloch Ital. Bund p. 8.

[^15]:    ${ }^{1}$ The plan of the regiones of the excavations is given by Fiorelli, Scavi di Pompei, 1861-1872, Naples, 1873, tab. 1, and in the map of Pompeii in C.I. L. rv.

[^16]:    ${ }^{1}$ Lapis Tiburtinus.

[^17]:    1 Not marble, as commonly stated; so far as I can find there are no Oscan inscc. on marble.

    - The initial $\nabla$ of 11.1 and 4 stands in the margin to the right of the vertical line from which the other lines begin.

[^18]:    10 bis (Not. Scav. 1895 p. 207) niveela

[^19]:    ${ }^{1}$ For the Euboean origin of the town see an interesting passage in Beloch's Campanien ${ }^{2}$, p. 147 f., with p. 438, and for the date of its foundation id. Nachträge, p. 435 ff., and Helbig, Hom. Epos ${ }^{2}$, p. 430.
    ${ }^{2}$ Stra. 5, p. 246.
    ${ }^{3} 500-420$ в.с., Head, p. 31.
    ${ }^{4}$ About 421 в.c. according to Diod. Sic. 12. 76, 420 according to Liv. 4.44. Mommsen's ascription (in C. I. L. x. p. 350) of the date 428 to Diodorus must be due, I think, to some clerical error, as the whole chapter in D. relates events of 421 (cf. Thuc. 5. 32), and the archon by whom the next chapter is dated cannot be attributed to any one of the years $428-420$ except 420 itself, see Clinton, Fast. Hellen. at these dates. To Thucydides $(6,4)$ Cumae was $\varepsilon v$ 'O $\pi \iota \kappa l a$, on which see 153 A inf.

[^20]:    ${ }^{1}$ I.e. while the island was in the nominal possession of Naples, which took it over from Hiero some time after his victory over the Etruscans (Stra. 5. 4. 9), and surrendered it to Rome (Suet. Aug. 93) probably at the peace in 326 b.c. (Liv. 8. 26), see Mom. U. D. p. 198, though Beloch (Camp. ${ }^{2}$ p. 447) refers the surrender to the time of Sulla, and the insc. to the third century.
    ${ }^{2}$ With $\rangle=0$ and $C=\sigma$, see the note to 8 sup.
    3 This use of the aor. partc. occurs also in other inscc. of this district, e.g. C. I. G. 5790 b from Naples (Beloch, Camp. ${ }^{2}$ p. 8).
    ${ }^{4}$ It seems probable (Mom, C. I. L. x. p. 170) that they revolted and again submitted, along with the Neapolitans, in 326 b.c., unless, with Beloch (Camp. ${ }^{2}$ p. 442), we regard this, and not 338 , as the date of their first contact with Rome.

[^21]:    ${ }^{1}$ See p. 99 inf. footu.

[^22]:    ${ }^{1}$ I read through (a) completely, but in (b), by mischance, I had not time to verify more than the points expressly mentioned in the notes.
    ${ }^{2}$ There is some discrepancy in the measurements given by previous editors, but these are correct.

[^23]:    ${ }^{1}$ Mommsen's view that this was one of two copies and preserved in Abella, the other being kept in Nola, seems less probable. The cost of erecting such a block and cutting so long an insc. would surely have been too considerable to allow of two copies where one would do.
    ${ }^{2}$ It was common for temples to be shared by neighbouring states (e.g. Liv. 8. 14 ut aedes lucusque Sospitae Junonis communis Lanuuinis municipibus cum populo Romano esset), and it was regular for all temples to be surrounded by trees and a certain amount of land (e.g. Liv. 24.3); see also Liv. 1. 45 for the foundation of the temple of Diana on the Aventine, shared by Romans and Latins [Mom, U.D. p. 125].

[^24]:    ${ }^{1}$ For the date of the Etruscan settlement in the town, see Beloch Campanien ${ }^{2}$ (the chapter on Capua init.) as against Mommsen C. I. L. x. p. 365. Cato says that the foundation by Etruscans was 260 years before its 'capture' by Rome; Mom. follows Velleius in referring this to the actual capture in 211 b.c. but this seems to allow too short a period for the Etruscan rule. Beloch adds the 260 to 338 , the date of the alliance of Capua with Rome; this again seems to give un unduly long space.

    - This seems more likely than Livy's (4. 37) date, 424 b.c. I do not understand Mommsen's interpretation of the date given by Diodorus, C. I. L. x. p. 365.

    3 There must, I think, be some phonetic relation, whether it be Oscan or Etruscan or both, between this ethnicon and the name of the town.

    4 Beloch Ital. Bund p. 117 ff., Camp. ${ }^{2}$ p. 300.

[^25]:    ${ }^{1}$ Beloch ib. p. 301 plausibly suggests 314 в.c. (after the revolt in the Samnite war) as a more probable date than 318, which is given by Livy (9.20).

[^26]:    ${ }^{1} I d . i b$. p. 307.

[^27]:    ${ }^{1}$ Except those of the eponymous ephors and Chaereas a Neapolitan.
    
    
    
    
    

[^28]:    ${ }^{1}$ Of. capere crines Plaut. Most. 1. 3. 69, Fest. 339 m., Dict. Antt. ${ }^{2}$ s. v. coma.

    - Poole, Catal. of Gr. Coins in Brit. Mus., Italy, p. 62-3, Head Hist. Num. p. 23.
    ${ }^{3}$ Babelon, Descr. hist. et chronol. des monum. de la Rép. rom. 1, p. 16 f.
    - Head Hist. Num., p. 32.
    ${ }^{5}$ Head Hist. Num., p. 18 and 370 inf.

[^29]:    ${ }^{1}$ Cf. Beloch Camp. ${ }^{2}$ p. 354 f.

    - No one who has seen the rather amusing array of these objects in the Museum will doubt their connexion with Lucina.

[^30]:    ${ }^{1}$ See Weissbrodt Philologus xliii. p. 444 ff., who points out, inter alia, that it became later on customary to write the second of two consecutive verticals longer than the first, cf. such symbols as viI, iI.

[^31]:    ${ }^{1}$ Hence Deecke (Wochenschr. für klass. Plut. 1887 p. 131) discovered a 'Sabellic' sign 1 .
    ${ }^{2}$ Neue Phil. Rundschau 1887, p. 123.

[^32]:    ${ }_{1}$ The $a$ in this word is $\mathcal{F}$.

[^33]:    ${ }^{1}$ Imhoof-Blumer calls it 'schreitend' but the facsimiles confirm Friedländer's description 'stehend.'
    ${ }^{2}$ Imhoof-Blumer conjectures that this is the initial of the artist who cut the die.

[^34]:    ${ }^{1}$ For the arrangement and notation see the List of Signs and Abbreviations.

    - The Routes of the Itineraries through Campania are given C. I. L. x. p. 58 ff .

[^35]:    ${ }^{1}$ Cf. p. 99 footnote 3.

[^36]:    1. Keller's suggestion (Lat. Volksetym. p. 14) is disproved by the forms with -b.
[^37]:    ${ }^{1}$ Three times, however, used of persons elsewhere called Pacci-.
    ${ }^{2}$ In C. I. L. x. 7125 (Sicily) Perpenna.
    C.

[^38]:    ${ }^{1}$ Vallia twice in an insc. from the island Gaulus near Malta, C. I. L. x. 7508.
    ${ }^{2}$ Also classical, e.g. Liv. 23. 8.

[^39]:    1 With dative Papati.

[^40]:    ${ }^{1}$ E.g. Liv. 10. ce. 11, 38, 39, where 'Samnites' adjoin Lucanians.
    ${ }^{2}$ For the distinction between the Pentri and Caraceni, see p. 183, inf. Beloch (Ital. Bd. p. 167) counts the Caudini also as an integral tribe.
    ${ }^{3}$ Liv. 40. 38, compared with the epitaph of the first Scipio, C. I. L. I. ${ }^{1} 30$.
    ${ }^{4}$ Vell. 1. 14, Fest. p. 340 M.
    ${ }^{5}$ Vell. ib., Liv. 9. 26.

[^41]:    ${ }^{1}$ The Romans made no official distinction between Pentri and Caraceni.

[^42]:    ${ }^{1}$ For the arrangement and notation, see the list of Signs and Abbreviations.
    ${ }^{2}$ From C. I. L. Ix. 968-2193, 6255-6294, 6407.

[^43]:    ${ }^{1}$ Beloch (Ital. Bund, p. 169) does not notice the passage from Livy.

[^44]:    ${ }^{1}$ Including however three rows of seats on the orchestra of the theatre.

[^45]:    U. D. p. 173, Fabr. 2872, Zvet. Osc. 20.

[^46]:    ' According to Mancini, Giornal. Scav. Pomp. Iv. 32.

[^47]:    ${ }^{1}$ According to Garrucci Mon. d. Ital. Ant. p. 91.

[^48]:    ${ }^{1}$ Mommsen, Monn. Rom. 1. p. 164 n., regards this $H$ or ) as $=\dot{\eta} \mu-$-, and despite the objections of Friedländer (O. M. p. 27) and Dressel (l. c. p. 252 n.), the fact that it occurs on no silver coins except half-obols and half-litiae shows decisively that it must have had that meaning. Prof. Ridgeway suggests to me that the curved strokes indicate that (like the Greek 5, originally F, for 6) it had become a mere sign of value whose meaning as a letter was no longer understood.
    
    

[^49]:    1 These specimens are well preserved and therefore are probably not damaged half-litrae, the normal weight of which in the Campanian standard is about 38-35 grammes, Head p. 33 ff., Mommsen-Blacas i. p. 163.

[^50]:    ${ }^{1}$ For the arrangement and notation see the List of Signs and Abbreviations.
    ${ }^{2}$ The tables of the Itineraries for Samnium are given C. I. L. Ix. pp. 203-4.

[^51]:    ${ }_{1}$ Each letter and interpunct is distinct in a cast of the coin which I owe to the kindness of M. Ernest Babelon of the Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris.

[^52]:    ${ }^{1}$ For other Oscan glosses see pp. 149 and 200.

[^53]:    ${ }^{1}$ Written, i.e. classical Roman Latin has the tenues regularly, pelagus, poeta, talentum, crater, etc.
    ${ }^{2}$ Which in Latin is occasionally represented by a doubled letter, e.g. struppus $=\sigma \tau \rho \delta \phi$ os 105 inf . and several interesting examples in Lindsay, Lat. Lang. p. 58.

[^54]:    ${ }^{1}$ Some 30 examples of Gr. asp. = vulg. Lat. tenuis in Saalfeld Lautges. $d$. Gr. Lehnw. im Lat., pp. 22 ff., others in Seelmann, Ausspr. d. Lat. p. 259. Bruges (Cic. Orat. 48. 160, Quint. 1. 4. 15) and ballaena $=\phi \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \alpha \iota v a$ are the only exceptions (galbanum $\chi a \lambda \beta a \nu \eta$ is Semitic). The first, as Prof. Ridgeway points out to me, is Macedonian with the regular $\beta$ for $\phi$ (as in $\mathrm{B} \epsilon \rho \in \nu i \kappa \eta$ ) and appears naturally in Ennius, just when the Romans had made acquaintance with Asia Minor through Macedonia. Strabo (p. 550) juoíws $\delta \in$ é $\beta$ púyot kal Bpúres кal $\Phi$ púres oi aúrol (cf. Herodt. 6. 45, 7. 185). Ballaena is difficult; if it comes from the Attic form it may owe its $b$ to some word or words which the Italian sailors connected with it, especially bellua [or ballista as a 'shooter' of foam, J. P. P.]. Any derivation is better than none for a strange word, as we all know, cf. Eng. 'sparrow-grass' for asparagus, Germ. 'Bibelapothek' for Bibliothek.

[^55]:    ${ }^{1}$ In discussing this form，Kretschmer in his valuable monograph Die Gr． Vaseninschriften ihrer Sprache nach untersucht（p．152）has overlooked the Italic evidence．

[^56]:    ${ }^{1}$ The statement of Diod. 20. 90. 3 that the Romans in 305 b.c. Пeגcroovs
     reias is reasonably interpreted by Beloch (It. Bund, p. 51 ) as referring to the kindred Vestine or Sabine people of the upper Aternus valley round Amiternum.

[^57]:    ${ }^{1}$ See Pauli Altit. Stud. v. p. 18 ff. The clearest of these is the use of postpositions (poimunien, pritrome), and others (at present not fully established) are the nom, sing. fem. in $-a$ instead of $-u$, the (occasional?) absence of final $-i$ in the dat. sing. masc. $(-\bar{o})$ and fem. $(-\bar{t}$ and $-\bar{e})$, and of $-d$ in the ablative (aetatu fertlid). The sibilation of $-i$ - (vitad) to a $\check{z}$-sound (Eng. $j$ ?) is parallel to the change in S. Oscan Bansae.

[^58]:    1 Prof. von Heinemann has no doubt that the concluding pages of his Ms., among which are pp. 333-4, though on different paper, were written like the rest by Gude himself.

[^59]:    1 This appears even in Pauli's own representation of the edge, with the single exception of the $a$ in 1.5 , which would also be true to line if he had made it of the same size as the $a$ beneath and not needlessly larger.

[^60]:    ${ }^{1}$ Hence Jordan's conjectures (Quaest. Umbricae p. 6) are needless.

[^61]:    ${ }^{1}$ For the arrangement and notation see the List of Signs and Abbreviations,
    ${ }^{2}$ For the tables of the Itineraries through the Marrucini, v. C. I. L. Ix. pp. 203-4.

[^62]:    ${ }^{1}$ For the arrangement and notation see the List of Signs and Abbreviations.
    ${ }^{2}$ The Itinerary routes through Vestine country are given C. I. L. Ix. pp. 203, 204.

[^63]:    ${ }^{1}$ This and the two following exx. from Lindsay, Lat. Language p. 41, where other less certain exx. may be found.
    ${ }^{2}$ [Constitit seems right, and grande, grave; the assimilation to saxeum was easy. J. P. P.]

[^64]:    ${ }^{1}$ For the arrangement and notation see the List of Signs and Abbreviations.
    ${ }^{2}$ From C. I. L. x. $4734-4778,8249-8258,8388-8394$ etc.

[^65]:    ${ }^{1}$ Iucluding perhaps even Sabine, see $I d g$. Forsch. ii. p. 163 footn. 3.

[^66]:    ${ }^{1}$ I have not counted as such the omission of the final $s$ in the nom. sing. masc. of Gentile and other names, since it occurs in Rome itself and several other parts of Italy (Falisci, Marsi, Sabini, Campania, Hirpini, etc.), see the Indices to C. I. L. It is, however, remarkably frequent in Praeneste: ' of 145 sepulchral inscc. [of the burial ground of $250-150$ в.с., 3046-3310] 27 have the nomen ending in -ius (-us), 3 in -ios, but 53 in -io and 63 in - $i$ ' (Index C. I. L. xiv); in other insce. of Praeneste (eod. teste) final $-s$ is omitted 32 times. Similarly I have not regarded as any mark of dialect the frequent omission of vowels in writing (cf. note to 272 inf.) e.g. Atlia, Dcumius, Mgolnia, though as a custom in writing it is perhaps a mark of Etruscan influence, see the long list of examples given by Lattes p. 60 ff .

[^67]:    ${ }^{1}$ This has Tetdius, which may be only a contraction in writing like those mentioned in the note to 272 . Or is it for Tettius?

[^68]:    ${ }^{1}$ Or 'they,' for the word is in the plur. in the Latin insc. of Sulmo just cited, see the note to 206 sup.
    ${ }^{2}$ See De Nino's charming collection of Usi e Costumi Abruzzesi.

[^69]:    ${ }^{1}$ If so, for the ending perhaps, cp. luisarifs 101 sup.

[^70]:    ${ }^{1}$ For the arrangement and notation see the List of Signs and Abbreviations.
    ${ }_{2}$ The tables of the Itineraries in the Marsian country are given C. I. L. ix., pp. 203-4.

[^71]:    ${ }^{1}$ For the arrangement and notation see the List of Signs and Abbreviations.
    ${ }^{2}$ From C. I. L. Ix. 3649-3905, 6347-8, 6413 ete.

[^72]:    ${ }^{1}$ Here, as elsewhere (p. 83 footn.), I do not understand the dates (270 and 362 a.0.c. respectively) which Mommsen (C. I. L. Ix. p. 388) derives from Diodorus.

[^73]:    ${ }^{1}$ Following Lattes Iscriz. Paleolat. d. Prov. Etr. p. 60 ff., who followed Sittl, Lokale Verschiedenheit d. Lat. Spr., p. 23, who seems to have first noticed the passage in Scaurus.

[^74]:    ${ }^{1}$ Unless af solo 'ab solo' were reckoned as such; but af occurs in Roman insce., see 205 Rem, 1 sup., p. 222.

[^75]:    1 For the arrangement and notation see the List of Signs and Abbreviations.
    2 For the Itinerary-routes through Hernican country see C. I. L. x. p. 60.

[^76]:    ${ }^{1}$ Now being published in full by the German Archaeological School at Rome, see 'Etruskische Spiegeln,' Vol. v. ff., Berlin 1884.

[^77]:    1 This information I owe to a kind communication from Pauli (May 21, 1896) : the reff. are: Aptronia=Etr. Apatıu Fabr. 2535 a etc., Masclia=Etr. Maslni, fem. -nei ib. 1441-2 al., Tappuria=Etr. Tap(u)sina ib. 286, 258, Voesia $=$ Etr. Vuisi, frequent, e.g. ib. 125, also Vuisi-ni, -nei. He adds that the Etr. Gentile names may add the suffixes -ni (fem. -nia) or -na (fem. -nei), so that the same person may, e.g., be called Petru, Petruni and Petruna; and that the $c$ in Masclia is probably parasitic, Etr. Maslni being the genuine form.

[^78]:    ${ }^{1}$ Dr A．S．Murray of the British Museum，of whom I enquired whether any further archaeological evidence of the date of this insc．had appeared since Helbig wrote，has very kindly sent me the following note（Feb．10，1896）．
    ＇The latest writer I know on this question is Gsell（Fouilles dans la necropole de Vulci，Paris，1891，p．420－1）．His conclusion is that the gold fibula with an Etruscan insc．in the Louvre（Martha，L＇Art Etrusque，1889，Pl．I．fig．12）and everything else of the same kind，in the Regulini－Galassi tomb or elsewhere， belong to a period extending from about the middle of the VII century в．с．to nearly the middle of the VI century．＇
    ${ }^{2}$ On the occurrence of the sound of digamma and its symbol $\lceil$ in other Chalcidian colonies cf．Roberts，Introd．Gr．Epig．p． 200 foll．，especially no．180， p．204，and the authorities there cited．

[^79]:    'Victory crowns Paris, who sits leaning on a spear' (Garrucci, Sylloge 535).

[^80]:    ${ }^{1}$ In an insc. referring to the same man who is called Vettulenus in an inse. from the (pure) Latin district, Note xxxviii. B. inf.

[^81]:    ${ }^{1}$ For the arrangement and notation see the List of Signs and Abbreviations.
    ${ }^{2}$ For the routes given by the Itineraries through Latium Vetus, see C. I. L. x. p. 59 f.

[^82]:    ${ }^{1}$ These towns in the valley of the Anio were reckoned by Augustus in Latium (Regio I), not with the Aequi in Regio V, though geographically they would seem rather Aequian than Latin.

[^83]:    ${ }^{1}$ Keller Lat. Volksetym. p. 23 explains this most happily as formed from flumen on the pattern of the Porta Nomentana.

[^84]:    ${ }^{1}$ Cf. Petelinus above, under 3.
    ${ }^{2}$ The two forms Subura and *Sugusa are clearly identical, but how? Keller's view (Lat. Volksetym. p. 22) is unlikely and unsupported historically; Jordan's (Krit. Beitr. p. 162) and Darbishire's (Camb. Philolog. Soc. Transact. iii. p. 198 $=$ Relliq. Philol. p. 101) is attractive, but greatly needs support.

[^85]:    ${ }^{1}$ For the arrangement and notation see the List of Signs and Abbreviations.
    ${ }^{2}$ For the Itineraries in Sabine country, see C. I. L. Ix. p. 203-4.

[^86]:    ${ }^{1}$ See Deecke, Die Falisker, p. 13 ff.

[^87]:    ${ }^{1}$ Perhaps worth quoting here: U]mpricius C. f. [C]aburcus q. Apolinci dat.

[^88]:    ${ }^{1}$ Which has, perhaps, a distant likeness to but (pace Lignana) is quite different from a part of a picture on an Etruscan mirror (Gerhard, Etr. Spieg. 1. 83; 'Bacchus and Semele'). The mirror contains a third figure, and the position of the two chief figures is reversed.

[^89]:    ${ }^{1}$ This was one of the years of the folio-issue.

[^90]:    Note sli. (a) The following insc. which was found in Falleri is difficult to assign. Deecke (no. 63) calls it Falisco-Umbrian, regarding the final $-u$ as equivalent to Lat. and Fal. - $a$ of the nom. fem. sing. But while the other

[^91]:    ${ }^{1}$ I can discover no authority for the form Volsones given by Kiepert Alt. Geogr. p. 408. But cf. fundus Volsonianus p. 391.

[^92]:    ${ }^{1}$ See Part II. A inf.
    ${ }_{2}$ See Prof. Ridgeway's article Umbria in the Encycl. Britann. ed. 9, and the sections on Umbria in recent volumes of Not. Scav. Etruscan inscc. have been found at Tuder, Vettona and Pisaurum (Deecke, Gröber's Grundr. Rom. Phil. p. 346).
    ${ }^{3}$ The Naharlum numen of 357 inf. 1.17 has often been taken as referring to this colony; but it is clear that not Latins, but some other tribe dwelling on the Nar were the enemies denounced under this name by the authors of the Iguvine liturgy, since numen always takes a tribal not local epithet. [W. R.]

[^93]:    1 The text of the minute of the purchase in the town archives is given by Bréal p. 309; the extract from Concioli on p. rr.

    - The passage is quoted from the Latin version of this work published at Cologne in 1567, by Bréal p. 311.

[^94]:    ${ }^{1}$ On the form of the name see p. 405 footn.

[^95]:    ${ }^{1}$ Both in the Umb. and the Lat. $\alpha \beta h$ is often added to a vowel simply as a sign of its length; for the same purpose, occasionally, vowels are written doubly, and more often, in the Lat. a $\beta$, an $h$ is inserted between them; thus persnimu, persnihmu, persnihimu are equivalent.
    ${ }^{2}$ In words like muieto, aitu (from *agetōd) $i$ probably represents a voiced palatal consonant, the outcome of $g$ before $i$ and $e$; see Am. Journ. Phil. xi. p. 306.
    C.

[^96]:    ${ }^{1}$ This change was earlier than the loss of $-d$ in the ablative of $\bar{a}$ - stems where, therefore, $-\bar{a}$ is preserved. Bücheler (Umb. p. 150) seems to regard the occasional -a in the neut. pl. in Tab. I and II as a Latinism. This seems improbable in face of the -o of Tables VI and VII.
    ${ }^{2}$ For divergent views see Von Planta, Osk.-Umb. Gram. p. 586, Conway, Class. Rev. vir. p. 466. The third change is complicated by the partial (i.e. conditional) loss of -8 in the earliest period, on which see Verner's Law in Italy, Appendix C.

[^97]:    ${ }^{1}$ Yet another possibility cannot be ignored. III and IV may be exact copies (except in the use of later forms of the letters) made at the end of the period, of a document itself containing archaisms written at the beginning or even earlier.

[^98]:    7 I follow Brugmann (q.v. Ber. Kön. Süchs. Ges. Wiss. 1893 p. 134) so far as to insert a comma at tedte, taking it as 'detur' or 'datur.'

    V a 15 The interp. is single and medial after K and T . 22 Aes furend. 29 Only the tip of the upper arm of $\underline{\underline{k}}$ is left, as the bronze is broken at the corner.

[^99]:    These long Tables are engraved with a considerable margin on the left, and into this the beginning of each paragraph projects two or three letters. But the last paragraph (eno ocar etc.) does not begin a new line, and is only marked off by two or three letters' space.

    The interp. is never used at the end of the line.

[^100]:    49 Aes preplo hotatu.

[^101]:    ${ }^{1}$ 'Judging by style I would assign the latest struck coins of Tuder to about 270 в.с. or perhaps rather later.' (B. V. H., April, 1896.)

[^102]:    Surena

[^103]:    ${ }^{1}$ For the notation see the List of Signs and Abbreviations.
    ${ }^{2}$ The tables of the Itineraries for Picenum are given C. I. L. Ix. p. 479 f.

[^104]:    ${ }^{1}$ For the arrangement and notation see the List of Signs and Abbreviations.
    ${ }^{2}$ From C. I. L. IX. 5013-5935, 6365-6386, 6413 a-6419, 6086 etc., and Kaibel 2247.

[^105]:    ${ }^{1}$ Once Minic., once Minu[cius], both of man known elsewhere.

